Anti-Pædo-Rantiſm;

OR

Mr. SAMUEL FINLEY's

Charitable PLEA for the SPEECHLESS

EXAMINED and REFUTED:

The Baptiſm of Believers

MAINTAIN'D;

AND

The Mode of it, by Immerſion,

VINDICATED.

By *ABEL MORGAN*, at *Middletown*, in EAST-JERSEY.

ISA. 9. 16. *The Leaders of this People cauſe them to Err.*

MARK 16. 15, 16. *And he ſaid unto them, Go ye into all the World, and preach the Goſpel to every Creature. He that* believeth, *and is* baptized, *ſhall be ſaved.*

COL. 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptiſm.*

PHILADELPHIA:

Printed by B. FRANKLIN, in *Market-Street.*

M,DCC,XLVII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE.

'TIS *not because I think the Controverſy about* Baptiſm *hath not been already fully and learnedly diſcuſſed, and the* proper *Subjects and Scriptural Mode of this ſacred Goſpel Ordinance, unanſwerably vindicated, by others of Abilities and Advantages far ſuperior to mine, that occaſions the following Sheets; but becauſe what I firmly believe to be the Truths of God, are ſtill oppoſed and ridiculed by Men of conſiderable Name and Figure, notwithſtanding what hath been heretofore ſo well penn'd in their Vindication: Knowing alſo, how ready many People are to be miſled with the Sound of Words, or a mere* Shew *of Argument, and to take* gilded *Errors for Scripture Truths from ſuch, without due and proper Examination; I can't think, but 'tis my Duty and Place (as well as others) to look upon the Seaſon to* * *be a* Time to ſpeak, *and improve it accordingly, notwithſtanding my many Inſufficiencies for the preſent Work, and wholly leave the Succeſs to the wiſe Orderer and Diſpoſer of all Things.*

Mr. Finley, *who ſometime ſince engag'd publickly againſt his Brethren the* Preſbyterians, *on the Account of ſome Difference happening amongſt them; and alſo (as he words it)* drew his Sword againſt the Moravians; *hath thought proper* now *to bend his* Forces *againſt the* Baptiſts: *Whether it is becauſe he* drove *all them before him, or becauſe they look'd on him to be ſuch an inconſiderable Enemy, not worth their while to divert him with any* Reſiſtance, *that there*

* Eccleſ. 3. 7.

is no more Employ for his Martial Valour, *in thoſe Quarters, and rather than lie ſtill, he would declare War againſt his inoffenſive Neighbours, I ſhall not undertake to determine.*

However, I may juſt obſerve, that we are not ſo frighten'd by the confuſed Noiſe of Abſurdities, Inconſiſtencies, Novelties, Nonſenſe, Challenges, *&c. which he muſters up againſt us, as to betake ourſelves to a precipitant Flight; but intend to give him an open Battle; for we judge we have the infallible Truth of God for our ſure Defence.*

Mr. F. *goes about to Apologize for his appearing in this Debate, leſt he ſhould be cenſur'd* as a Reviver of buried Controverſies: *But is it not hard to find in what Senſe the Controverſy about Baptiſm may be ſaid to be buried? when Men of oppoſite Principles are ſtill living, and never as I know of, agreed to ſay or write no more about their different Sentiments; and when both Sides have all along more or leſs pleaded for their Principles and Practice, as occaſion requir'd: But this ſerves well enough to make Way for him to bring in his ſham Reaſon for his Undertaking, viz.* That we were the Aggreſſors in this Controverſy, *which is manifeſtly groundleſs; and he is deſired to obſerve, that we don't acknowledge this Charge he brings againſt us: And he is at his Liberty to try if he can make it good in any* Shape, *if he thinks proper. So far as we were comfortably agreed formerly to* promote the main Cauſe of Religion, *for our Parts we are ſo ſtill. And for any of our Miniſters to urge upon the People the Neceſſity of being dipp'd or plung'd, is no new Thing; for 'tis all one as to urge upon them the Neceſſity of being Baptized; ſeeing we always ſaid, that their being* ſprinkled *in their Infancy was not Baptiſm, any more than Sprinkling is Dipping: And as to any Succeſs we had in bringing People (ſuitably qualified) to the Obedience of Chriſt's Commands, we deſire to bleſs God for it. But our Succeſs did not make us more confident that our Cauſe was good, as Mr.* F. *ſuggeſts; for we know, by ſad Experience, that People may have great Succeſs in a wrong Cauſe, witneſs* Infant Sprinkling: *We knew our Cauſe to be good before, and were as* confident *of it, as afterwards, becauſe it is warranted by the Word of God, whether there be* many *or* few *on our Side.*

With

With Reſpect to our Debate at Cape-May, *Mr.* Finley *ſays*, 'I did, 'tis true, *propoſe the Publick Diſpute* *, *and thought* 'myſelf neceſſitated to ſuch a Courſe, *ſeeing he had been at* 'the Place *ſome Days before I went, and had* Earneſtly 'perſwaded *the People to renounce their former Baptiſm,* 'and be dipt.' Anſ. *When I was at* Cohanſie, May 15th, *in the Year* 1743, *I was* importun'd *to viſit* Cape-May, *where a* Baptiſt *Church has been* conſtituted *and* ſettled *for* many *Years paſt* (*tho' they had not then any ſettled Miniſter*) *and had a Meeting Houſe of their own, and were then about building a new one at ſome Diſtance from the other, for their own* Uſe, *and greater Conveniency. Accordingly I went down, and reach'd there on* Tueſday *Night*; *and Mr.* Finley *came down from* Cohanſie *after me the* Thurſday *following: So that I was not very long there to perſuade the People to* renounce *their Baptiſm, as he expreſſes it, before he came. But in that time, I don't remember I had any Conference with any one ſingle Perſon about Infant Baptiſm: Neither did I ſpeak any thing of the Ordinance in Publick, till I underſtood there were ſeveral Perſons that propoſed to be* baptized; *upon which Occaſion I thought it Neceſſary and Expedient to open the* Nature *and* Deſign *of this Ordinance in Courſe, as I inſiſted on the Six Principles the Apoſtle mentions*; Heb. 6. 1, 2. *Which I did on* Thurſday *in the Afternoon* (*for the Perſons were to be baptized the next Day*) *with a View, in Particular, for the Help and Benefit of thoſe that were expected ſhortly to ſubmit to it; and did then, and do ſtill think myſelf juſtifiable in ſo doing, eſpecially on ſuch an Occaſion. Now this is the juſt and plain Account of the Affair, and all the Ground of Mr.* Finley's Emphatical *Way of expreſſing himſelf, of my having* earneſtly perſwaded the People to renounce their former Baptiſm and be dipt.--- *juſt as if they had all been educated* Preſbyterians. *And let him make the moſt of it he can, 'tis but a very ſlender Ground to Countenance his Conduct, in propoſing a publick Diſpute immediately upon it; juſt as if I had not the Liberty to preach what I believed to be the Truth of Chriſt, in a* Baptiſt *Meeting Houſe, on ſuch a* ſpecial *Occaſion* (*as he, or others, has in his*) *to a Baptiſt Church, and among a People, many*

* Which was carried on, by each of us preaching a Sermon on the Subject.

many of whom were inclin'd to our Way of Thinking, before I went down, as is manifeſt, by their joining together to build a New Meeting Houſe for their own proper Uſe; without being directly upon it, viz. the next Morning challeng'd, *or called upon by him, to diſpute the Matter publickly.*

Which Propoſal of his was as unneceſſary *as it was* arrogant; *ſeeing thoſe who then propoſed to be baptized (and ſeveral others) were already ſettled in the Point, and only wanted an Opportunity to obey the Lord in his ſacred Inſtitutions. And*

If he wanted to confirm his *People in their received Opinions, the Way was clear for him to do it, either by private Conference or publick Preaching amongſt them, without making Uſe of ſuch a* ſelfiſh, maſterly *Way, or infringing on the* Liberties *and* Privileges *of others;-- for I had as much Right to go and preach* there, *as* he *had himſelf.*

Whatever he, or his Favourites *may think or ſay on the Occaſion, or powever they may Gloſs over his* Conduct, *I am perſwaded it will appear to all impartial judicious Perſons, that I had very juſt and warrantable Grounds to do what I did, and that his whole* Procedure *in the Affair, looks more like a deſign'd intended Oppoſition, and buſying* himſelf in other Men's Matters, *when they only act in the proper Duties of their Station, than any Thing elſe.*

Now 'tis upon the Shoulders *of ſuch pretended Reaſons that his Performance is ſent abroad into the World: But as I once told him, if their Writing on the Subject, had the like Effect as their Preaching on it, we need not be much concerned; for to my Knowledge, divers Perſons ſprinkled in their Infancy, have been convinced that Infant Sprinkling is wrong, whilſt they heard their Miniſters labouring deſignedly to Eſtabliſh it; and, as I have been ſince inform'd, our Debate at* Cape-May *had ſome ſuch happy Effect.*

I am much of the Mind, that the more this Controverſy is handled, the more will People's Eyes be open'd to ſee the Truth according to Holy Scripture.

'*Before I conclude (ſays he) I muſt deſire of my Oppo-*
'*nents, that if any of them be diſpos'd to Remark upon this*
'*Piece, they would view my Arguments in their proper*
'*Light, and let them appear in their own Colour, without*
'Perverſion.' *How*

How closely I have followed this Rule *which he is pleas'd to* Chalk *out for his Opponents to work by (whom, it is like, he ſuſpects or prejudges to be* aukward, *if not wicked) will beſt appear in the Peruſal of the following Pages; only I would obſerve, perhaps this is intended for greater Service than one is aware of at firſt Sight; for let his* Arguments *be ever ſo* fairly *and* fully *overthrown, and made appear to be nothing but a* mere Heap of Words, *without the leaſt Foundation in* Scripture (*as the Sprinkling of Infants itſelf is*) *I can't tell but this* Preparative *will be uſed for a* Catholicon, *or an* Univerſal Remedy *againſt all Maladies; as Perſons whoſe Cauſe won't bear Examining, when they are refuted, generally ſay, that their Arguments are* perverted, *or taken in a* wrong Light: *Why, the Reaſon is, if their* own Colour *is wip'd off, they appear to be nothing elſe but manifeſt* Perverſion *of Scripture Truths. But we are told,* "*I ſpeak thus, becauſe I have known many of them act a* 'different *Part, in arguing againſt ſomething we never ſaid* 'inſtead *of Anſwering our Arguments.*" Reply. *Let the Reader ſuſpend his Judgment while he reads only the following Remarks on the firſt Part of his Performance, and he ſhall ſee whether we* Blunder *ſo wretchedly in our Anſwers, as Mr.* Finley *ſuggeſts; or is it becauſe their* Trumpets *give ſo very contrary* as well as uncertain Sounds, *that occaſions different Replies.*

Whilſt I was about to anſwer Mr. F's *Performance, I happen'd to light on another* Pamphlet, *written Dialogue-wiſe, on the Subject of Infant Baptiſm, without the Author's Name to it. I have taken ſome Notice of it (which in itſelf I judge ſcarcely worthy of any) becauſe I learn it is mightily cry'd up, to be ſome* Rara avis in Terris; *a mere* Non-ſuch; *far ſurpaſſing Mr.* Finley's: *But, for my Part, I can't think it ſurpaſſeth his in any Thing, unleſs it be in* Boldneſs *to aſſert* Falſhoods; *ſome of which I have taken Notice of; and if any deſire more Inſtances, I am ready, on proper Warning, to produce them.*

If any Perſons into whoſe Hands theſe Sheets may come, do think that 'tis unneceſſary to contend about this ſacred Goſpel Ordinance; and call it a Contending about Meats *and* Drinks, *under Pretence of living in Love and Peace*

with

with others that differ from them, I must needs say, that such Persons discover their Love to Christ but very poorly (if they have any Thing else at all besides a natural Affection raised and heated) when they can quietly look on, and see his Holy Ordinance trampled in the Mire, and despis'd, without attempting to put forth their Hand to raise up fallen Truth * *See* Jude, *ver.* 3. 1 Cor. 11. 2. *Let that Love and Peace be* Anathema, *which must be upheld by* sinful Silence *(which will make the Conscience within roar) and* maintain'd *at the Expence of the Ruins of Christ's sacred Institutions. True Christian Love discovers itself, in Regarding those who bear the* Image *of Christ, and in the mean Time* detecting *their* Errors, *and* reproving *their* Faults. Gal. 2. 11.

If it be objected, that I discover too much Positiveness *and Assurance, in my Way of Writing, I answer in the Words of the Reverend and judicious* † *Mr.* Dickinson, *of* Elizabeth-Town, *on another Occasion,* viz. *'I am as fully 'persuaded that the Cause I am defending is the Cause of 'God, as I am that the Scriptures are the Word of God. 'If I believe the one, I must believe the other, if it be possible 'to understand the Meaning of the most plain, familiar, and 'express Words that can be spoken.'*

And further in the said Reverend Author's Words, with little Variation, 'I have this to say in my Defence; tho' I 'am far from supposing myself Infallible; yet I don't think 'it a just Reason to run into Scepticism, *and to doubt 'of the Certainty of some of the plainest Truths in the Word 'of God, because I am fallible and liable to Mistake.---I am 'not willing to make a Compliment of such an* important *'Article of practical Godliness (upon which* the Glory of 'Christ, Gospel Order, and the Beauty, Excellency, 'and Regularity of the New Testament Church do so 'much depend*) to any Persons of what Name or Character 'soever; or to appear Wavering or Uncertain about it, that 'I may avoid* this *Censure; and bespeak the Character of a 'modest Writer.'*

That Truth may prevail above Error, Christianity spread in Purity, and Godliness abound with Power, 'till we all come

* Isa. 59. 14. Jer. 9. 3.

† Vide his *Preface* to his Sermon on the Nature and Necessity of Regeneration.

come in the Unity *of the Faith, and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect Man, unto the Meaſure of the Stature of the Fulneſs of Chriſt; is, and thro' Grace ſhall be the Prayer of him who deſires true Peace and Proſperity may increaſe within the Palaces of* Jeruſalem, *to the Glory of God; unto whoſe benign Bleſſing and Diſpoſal I commit my* poor *Labours in his Service.*

A. M.

20 MA 64

Anti-Pædo-Rantiſm;

OR

Mr. SAMUEL FINLEY's Charitable Plea for the Speechleſs,

EXAMINED *and* REFUTED, *&c.*

THE Goſpel Truth which we believe and maintain, with reſpect to the Subjects of Baptiſm, is, *That thoſe Perſons who profeſs their Faith in Chriſt, and Repentance for their Sins, are the only proper Subjects of Baptiſm.* Some of the Places of Holy Scripture whereupon our Faith is grounded, are theſe; *Mat.* iii. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. *Then went out to him* Jeruſalem *and all* Judea, *and all the Region round about* Jordan, *and were baptized of him in Jordan,* confeſſing their Sins. *But when he ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadducees come to his Baptiſm, he ſaid unto them, O Generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath to come? Bring forth therefore Fruits* meet for Repentance, *and think not to ſay within yourſelves, we have* Abraham to our Father: *For I ſay unto you, that God is able of theſe Stones to raiſe up Children unto Abraham. John* iv. 1. *When therefore the Lord knew, how that the Phariſees had heard, that Jeſus* made *and baptized more Diſciples than John. Mat.* xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* Compared with *Mark* xvi. 15. 16. *And he ſaid unto them, Go ye into all the World, and* preach the Goſpel *to every Creature, he that* believeth and is baptized, *ſhall be ſaved; but he that believeth not ſhall be damned. Acts* ii. 41. *Then they that*

that gladly received his Word *were baptized: And the ſame Day there were added unto them about Three Thouſand Souls.* Chap. viii. 12. *But when they* believed *Philip preaching the Things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, they were* baptized both Men and Women. *Verſe* 36, 37. *And as they went on their Way, they came unto a certain Water; and the Eunuch ſaid, See, here is Water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, if* thou believeſt with all thine Heart, *thou mayeſt.* Chap. x. 47, 48. *Can any Man forbid Water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, which have* received the Holy Ghoſt, *as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord.* Chap. xvi. 30,----34. *And brought them out, and ſaid, Sirs, what muſt I do to be ſaved? And they ſaid, Believe on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and thou ſhalt be ſaved, and thy Houſe. And they ſpake unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his Houſe. And he took them the ſame Hour of the Night, and waſhed their Stripes, and was baptized, he and all his ſtraightway. And when he had brought them into his Houſe, he ſet Meat before them and rejoiced,* believing in God, with all his Houſe. *Chap.* xviii. 8. *And* Criſpus, *the Chief Ruler of the Synagogue,* believed on the Lord with all his Houſe: *And many of the* Corinthians, *hearing, believed, and were baptized.*

Theſe Texts of Holy Scripture, with others that might be mentioned, are ſo clear and full to the Purpoſe *(That profeſſing Believers are the only proper Subjects of Baptiſm)* that one might well *wonder* how any Doubt or Controverſy ſhould happen, or be carried on about this Matter. But notwithſtanding the Point is ſo *clearly confirmed* by Scripture, 'tis well known that our Opponents, who ſtrenuouſly plead for their Infants having a Right to Baptiſm, do take much Pains in order to overthrow it; which makes it neceſſary for us to ſtand in Vindication of this valuable Scripture Doctrine; ſo the troubleſome Diſpute continues.

I think it is obſervable, that Controverſies are always promoted and augmented, when Things quite foreign are ſhuffled in, and inſiſted on, as tho' they were the very

ry Subſtance of the Points debated; and as ſuch a Practice argues either Weakneſs in Perſons to diſtinguiſh what belongs to a Caſe in Hand, and what not, or elſe evidently beſpeaks real Want of Argument, to ſupport what is advanced; ſo it natively tends to carry on endleſs Striſe and Contention betwixt the Parties controverting, without much Profit, or bringing Things to a deſirable Iſſue.

To an impartial Reader, I believe this will appear to be the Caſe, reſpecting this much controverted Point, *viz.* Baptiſm: Now ſeeing it hath been long debated, who are the only and proper Subjects of this Goſpel Ordinance, one might judge the only direct and ready Way to come at the Knowledge of the Truth, and end the Conteſt, would be, to begin with the firſt *Account* the Scriptures give of this Ordinance, and having trac'd it all thro' the New-Teſtament, to believe and practiſe according to the Precepts and Examples therein given of *Believers Baptiſm.* But our Opponents don't think proper to follow this Method; willing, it ſeems, to find ſomething, if it were poſſible, to countenance their received Practice of Infant Baptiſm: And tho' they have been already ſufficiently refuted, do ſtill entertain us with an uſeleſs Repetition of their Thread bare Arguments from *Abraham's Covenant* and *Circumciſion:* So that under the Name of Controverting about Baptiſm, the Debate is impertinently and uſeleſsly carried off to another Subject, *viz. Abraham's* Covenant. Juſt as if the ready Way to diſcover who are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm, was by looking back ſo far as unto *Abraham*, long enough before the Ordinance itſelf was inſtituted! Or, as if Chriſt, together with the Inſtitution of Baptiſm, had not given us full and ſufficient Information and Directions, who were to be the Subjects of it, without having Recourſe to *Abraham's* Covenant and Circumciſion, to ſupply the Defect! Is it not an evident and plain Truth that the Right and Title of any to Baptiſm, is of no older Date, than the Inſtitution of the Ordinance itſelf? And is it not as plain, that no good or ſufficient Argument can be brought from any Thing, before the Inſtitution

tion of Baptiſm, to prove the Right of Infants to it; ſeeing the Scriptures no where inform us, that Chriſt ordered, or commanded his Diſciples to baptize Infants; neither have we any Inſtances of it, any where in the Word of God?

To what Purpoſe then ſerves their Argument from *Abraham*'s Covenant, ſince it is foreign to the Matter in Hand, and in Reality makes nothing for them, nor againſt us? Why, 'tis juſt to amuſe themſelves, and continue the unhappy Controverſy betwixt us. I can't ſay indeed, but pinching Neceſſity forces our Opponents upon this irregular Method of vindicating their Practice of baptizing Infants: Becauſe ('tis like) there appears not any Thing in the Inſtitution of Baptiſm, or in the continued Practice of the Apoſtles afterwards, worth their while to begin on. But after all, their far-fetch'd Arguments don't conclude for them, beſides other Reaſons, becauſe the Scripture Account of the Subjects of Baptiſm makes utterly againſt them. What Advantage Mr. *Finley* propoſes to himſelf, or to the Cauſe he pleads for, by his Diſtinction of a Two-fold being in the Covenant of Grace, the one ſavingly and according to God's Purpoſe of Election, and the other not ſavingly, but only in the Sight of the viſible Church, does not readily appear; conſidering he hath not improved this Diſtinction to his preſent Purpoſe, by giving us ſome Inſtances of the Apoſtles baptizing the Infant Seed of Believers, upon this of their being viſibly in the Covenant of Grace, or upon any other Account; but as this was not poſſible for him to do, his Diſtinction is uſeleſs in this preſent Controverſy.

He tells us indeed (if we are pleaſed to believe him) that all Church-members, and their Seed are in Covenant, as all the *Iſraelites*, old and young, were in it. *Deut.* xxix. 10, 11. But this can't be, for that Covenant made with the *Iſraelites*, at their Return out of *Egypt*, is aboliſhed. *Jer.* xxxi. 31, 32. *Heb.* viii. 8, 9. The Scripture is plain, that the New Covenant is not according to that: And Mr. *F.* has not produced any Place of Scripture to prove that the Infant Offspring of Church-

Church-Members are viſibly in the New-Covenant, therefore his Aſſertion is groundleſs.

To ſay that Believer's Infants are viſibly in the New-Covenant, by natural Generation, or Birthright, is abſurd; beſides it would be inconſiſtent with *Deut.* xxix. 10, 11, *&c.* where the Little ones, there mentioned, were not in that Covenant by Birthright;---and to imagine they are brought into the Covenant viſibly by Baptiſm, is alſo abſurd; for then they are not viſibly in the Covenant before Baptiſm: It therefore follows, that our Opponents can't pretend to baptize them, as being viſibly in the Covenant before, if it is by Baptiſm they are brought viſibly into Covenant, unleſs the Infants of Believers are viſible and not viſible in the Covenant at the ſame Time, which to affirm, is not very good Senſe; How trifling then and inſignificant muſt ſuch a Diſtinction be, to ſupport a Cauſe which wants better Proof?

And what does Mr. *Finley* ſeek to do further, by his Diſtinction of a Two-fold Way of Sealing the Covenant, *viz. Internal by the Holy Spirit*, and *External by the Sacraments*? Is it that the Infants of Believers, ought to be ſealed with the Sacrament of Baptiſm? Why it wont help him at all, for this Reaſon, becauſe God has not order'd him to do it---I ſay God has never commanded to baptiſe Believer's Infants, neither have we any Examples of Infant Baptiſm, in any Part of the Word of God; 'tis therefore horrid Preſumption in any, to adminiſter this Ordinance unto them: If Mr. *F.* denies this, I demand the Place of Scripture, which authoriſeth him to baptize Believer's Infants; and if he can't produce any divine Warrant for his Practice, as I know he hath not, he is deſired to obſerve, that his Conſequence upon Conſequence is no Divine Authority; and therefore utterly inſufficient to bear him out in his preſent Practice: For according to Holy Scripture, none are to be baptized but thoſe who make a Profeſſion of their Faith and Repentance; and ſo at leaſt profeſs they have the Internal Sealing, or the Work of God's Spirit upon their Hearts firſt, before they receive the External, *viz.* Baptiſm; ſeeing the fromer, as Mr. *F.* acknowledges, is *ſignified and repreſented*

represented by the latter * Only keeping close to this Order and Appointment of God in the New Testament, Mr. *F.* may, for me, enjoy the Benefit of his Distinctions as long as he pleases. We are well satisfied that the Direction of Christ (the wise Lawgiver) to administer Baptism to professing Believers, and the Practice of the Apostles who baptized only such, is a much safer Guide to us, than all Mr. *Finley*'s Notions and Consequences from *Abraham*'s Covenant and Circumcision can be to him, to administer this Holy Ordinance to *Infants*, without any *Divine* Command or *Apostolical* Example at all. And further, tho' our Opponents are very fond to call the Sacraments the Seals of the Covenant of Grace, yet they are not to administer them to any, but according to the Divine Directions.

Were it the Will of God, that Believer's Infants should be baptized, can this Gentleman imagine the Almighty would not have inform'd us thereof? undoubtedly he would; for there is as much Necessity of a Divine Warrant to baptize Believer's Infants, as there was for the Circumcising the Jewish Infants: For the Command to circumcise, can never authorize any to baptize them; because Circumcision and Baptism are two different Ordinances, in two distinct different Administrations, and both dependant on two distinct Institutions. And for our Opponents to find fault that their Infants are not now to be baptized, as the *Jewish* Infants were circumcised formerly, is nothing less than to quartel with the Wisdom, Sovereignty, and good Pleasure of Almighty God; and what can be more daring or presumptuous?

Mr. *Finley's* first Enquiry is, Whether the Infants of such as are Members of the visible Church have a Right to the Ordinance of Baptism? To which I answer in the Negative. And 'tis very just I should deny Infants to have a Right to Baptism; because there is no mention made of it in Holy Writ. 'Tis no where recorded in Scripture, that all Infants, or any Infants at all were baptized upon the Consideration of their being in Covenant. There is no just and necessary Consequence from any Scriptures

* Page 4.

Scriptures compared together to ſupport it. 'Tis not urg'd upon the Parents throughout the whole Word of God, to be their Duty to bring their Infants to Baptiſm. There is no Bleſſing promiſed if they do. There is no Threatning denounc'd againſt them if they don't. Again, there is no Divine Authority given to any to baptize them; for the Words of the Commiſſion run thus: *Preach the Goſpel to every Creature; he that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved*, Mark xvi. 15, 16. Mr. *F.* may know, how big ſoever his Argument for Infant's Right to Baptiſm from *Abraham*'s Covenant appears in his own Eyes, yet when, according to *his Orders*, we weigh it in the *Ballance of the Sanctuary*, we find it won't paſs current in any Province where Money goes by *Weight*, becauſe lighter than a ſingle *Grain* of Truth; which will further appear, when his following Aſſertions are examined---the firſt of which is, 'That the Infant Seed of 'Church Members were once By divine Appointment 'taken into Covenant with their Parents, had the then 'Seal of it apply'd to them, and ſo were Members of the 'viſible Church.'

Reply. Our Opponents and we ſeem to be agreed in our Sentiments about the Covenant of Grace, when they ſay, that the Covenant of Grace was made with Chriſt, as the ſecond Adam, and in him with all the Elect, as his Seed. † What a Pity then it is, that we can't have the ſame determinate Idea's reſpecting the Covenant (mentioned in this Aſſertion) and ſo bring this unpleaſant Controverſy, to its much deſired and final Period. But the Caſe is yet otherwiſe; for Mr. *F.* aſſerts, That the pure Covenant of Grace was made with *Abraham* and his Seed. And ſome other Gentleman (to help on the Cauſe of Infant-Baptiſm to be ſure) has lately printed, 'That 'it was truly the Covenant of Grace made with *Abra-* '*ham*, on Behalf of himſelf, and both his Natural and 'Spiritual Seed, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*.'‡ How our Opponents do to underſtand their aboveſaid Aſſertions

 con-

† Vid. *Aſſembly's Larger Catechiſm.* Queſt. 31. ‡ A Dialogue between a Miniſter and one of his Pariſhioners, entitled *Divine Right of Infant-Baptiſm.* Printed at New-York. 1746. Page 16.

conſiſtent with themſelves, or with the Truth of Things, and at the ſame Time ſuppoſe the Point they plead for is eſtabliſhed, undoubtedly is an *Art* peculiar to themſelves; for the Covenant of Grace comprehends all Believers in it: What odd Divinity would it be to teach that every Believer is not in the Covenant of Grace, but that Covenant made with *Abraham* (of which Circumciſion was a Token) did not comprehend every Believer in it, which lived even in the Days of *Abraham*, as is moſt evident from Scripture? *Shem*, *Melchizedeck* and *Lot*, who were true Believers, yet were never admitted into *Abraham*'s Covenant by Circumciſion---Surely they muſt have a ſtrange Turn of Thought, who ſay, that *Abraham*'s Covenant was a pure Covenant of Grace, in the Manner our Opponents plead for; and then aſſert, as Mr. *F.* does (unleſs he ſhamefully equivocates) *Out of* Abraham's *Covenant there is no Salvation.* According to this Aſſertion I would aſk him, What became of thoſe above-mentioned Godly Men, who were not in *Abraham*'s Covenant, nor had the Seal of it (ſo called) adminiſtred to them? Did they go to Hell and periſh? By no means. Were they ſaved? Yes. By the Covenant of Works? No. How, by the pure Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*? No, for they were not in it.

And out of *Abraham*'s Covenant, there is no Salvation. How then? Why, to unlock this Riddle Mr. *F.* may, if he pleaſes, uſe his *own*,† and Mr. *Flavel*'s Key.

'They could neither be juſtified nor condemned in 'this Life. Juſtified they could not be, for they were 'out of *Abraham*'s Covenant: Condemned they could not 'be, for they were righteous Perſons. But this is not 'all; in the World to come they could neither go to 'Heaven nor Hell: To Heaven they could not go, be-'cauſe out of *Abraham*'s Covenant: To Hell they could 'not go, becauſe juſtified. But ſtill it is more wonderful 'to conſider, that they muſt be fully juſtified, and fully 'condemned at the ſame Time: Fully juſtified, becauſe 'the Scripture ſays as much; fully condemned, becauſe 'out of the Covenant made with *Abraham*.' Now all theſe

† Charitable Plea. Page 25.

theſe are plain Abſurdities, yet they natively follow from Mr. *Finley*'s Aſſertions, in his charitable Plea; therefore his Aſſertions are abſurd. But ſeeing there was Salvation to thoſe Godly Perſons---There is Room enough for us to oppoſe our Opponent's Arguments, and ſtill affirm the Covenant of Grace was *made* with Chriſt only on Behalf of others, long before *Abraham* was born---That it was revealed to him, *&c.* For the Scripture ſpeaks of but two crowned Heads, or publick Perſons, as Covenant Heads, in Behalf of others, *viz.* The firſt *Adam*, with whom the Covenant of Works was made; and the Second *Adam*, the *Lord* from Heaven, with whom the Covenant of Grace was *made*: And for our Opponents to ſay, the Covenant of Grace was *made* with *Abraham* on Behalf of others, is an Aſſertion which does not concur very well with Holy Scripture! Beſides, what an odd ſhaped Covenant does Mr. *F.* repreſent the Covenant of Grace to be; according to him, ſome Believers or gracious Perſons muſt be left out, and ſome carnal unregenerate Ones taken in! for he affirms, that all Church Members and their Seed are in Covenant, but not all in it ſavingly.

How weak and inconcluſive alſo does the Argument from *Abraham*'s Covenant appear to be, to prove Infant-Baptiſm; for if gracious Men, who lived in the Days of *Abraham*, were not circumciſed, becauſe God had not appointed or commanded them, much leſs then are the carnal Seed of Believers now to be baptized without his Command or Appointment. Hence we learn it was not a being in the Covenant, that gave any one a Warrant or Title to Ordinances, but the expreſs Order and poſitive Command of God: For Inſtance, *Lot* (who lived in the Days of *Abraham*) was a righteous Man, and beyond all Doubt in the Covenant of Grace made with Chriſt; yet it would have been Preſumption in him, and an Act of Will-worſhip for him to be circumciſed, becauſe God had not commanded him: If therefore it was the Command of God that made it a Duty to circumciſe, and gave any one a warrantable Right to Circumciſion, it conſequently follows, for any to be circumciſed without ſuch a Command, would have been unwarrantable, and

an Act of Will-worſhip, which none can think would be acceptable to God: The Application is eaſy, ſuppoſing (what we grant not) that the Seed of Believers, as ſuch, are in the Covenant of Grace (as Mr. *F.* urges) yet nothing ſhort of God's Command, or expreſs Order, can entitle them to Baptiſm, or authoriſe him to baptize them. Now ſeeing there is no Command of God for baptizing Infants, that Practice turns out unwarrantable, and an Act of Will-worſhip, even when we examine it on the Grounds or Arguments by which our Opponents would fain confirm it.

If it be ſtill argued from the antiquated Law of Circumciſion, that Infants were formerly circumciſed, and they ought now to be baptized; I anſwer, The Caſes are not at all parallel; for beſides other Differences, there was God's Command for the former, but not ſo for the latter; and this ought with modeſt Perſons, to make a wide Difference: Tho' Mr. *F.* hath Confidence enough to make light of God's poſitive Command, and expreſs Order, as an indifferent Thing, when he aſſerts, 'We 'have as good Ground as he,' * (i. e. to admit Infants 'to Baptiſm, as *Abraham* had to circumciſe them) for we 'have the very ſame Covenant.' 'Tis plain that *Abraham* had the expreſs Order of God to circumciſe Infants: But 'tis after a Manner confeſſed by Mr. *F.* (which is even ſo) that God hath given no Command or Order to baptize them; and yet he ſays they have as good Ground for the latter, as *Abraham* had for the former. I have already ſhewn that an Intereſt in the Covenant did not entitle Perſons to an Ordinance, but the Order of God; or elſe why was not *Lot* (and others) circumciſed? Even ſuppoſing Infants to be in the Covenant, yet they are not to be baptized for the Reaſon aboveſaid. And that anonymous Author, out of the abundance of his Aſſurance, without bluſhing, alſo ſays, † 'The Caſe is *exactly* the ſame, 'without any Difference.' I am even ſurprized at our Opponents, that they can preſume to talk at this Rate! Is the expreſs Order of God nothing in theſe Gentlemen's Eſteem?

* Page 69. † Divine Right of Infant Baptiſm, page 33.

Eſteem? Is this their Method of treating God's poſitive Commands, That they have as good Ground to proceed without them, as *Abraham* or others with them? How ſhocking muſt this be to pious and conſcientious Minds! For ſhame, let perpetual Darkneſs fully theſe preſumptuous Lines of infatuated Zeal! Let a Penitential Recantation heal this deadly Stab given to the Cauſe of Proteſtant Principles! How would the exalted *Cherubims* of Glory *bluſh* to hear their Aſſertion? Nay they would reject it with the ſwifteſt Abhorrence; who do nothing without, but always hearken to the Commandments of God. *Pſal.* 103. 20. Pray what makes any Thing to be a Duty, but the Order and Command of God? Why were the degenerate *Jews* of old ſo ſeverely threatened and puniſhed, but becauſe they did that which God commanded them not? It does no ways appear that they have as good Ground to baptize their Infants, as *Abraham* had to circumciſe his. And further, I am quite free to ſay, our Opponents can never make their Aſſertions good; for there is an *eternal* Difference betwixt what God has *ordered* and *commanded*, and what he has not.

Again, it is very obſervable, that the *Author* of the Whole Duty of Man, in his Repreſentation of the Covenant of Grace, hath been openly and publickly condemned by the Rev. and eſteemed Gentlemen Mr. *Whitefield*, and Mr. *Blair*. § Let us compare our Opponents Account of the Covenant of Grace, and that Author's Account of it together, and ſee how near they agree. The Author of the Whole Duty of Man ſaith, 'This ſecond 'Covenant was MADE with ADAM and us in him, 'preſently after his fall, and is briefly contain'd in theſe 'Words, *Gen.* 3. 15. where God declares that the Seed of 'the Woman ſhall break the Serpent's Head. And this 'was made up as the firſt was of ſome Mercies to be af-'forded by God, and ſome Duties to be performed by us.'

Where is the mighty Difference? That Author ſays the ſecond Covenant was MADE with *Adam*, and our Opponents ſay, That the pure Covenant of Grace was MADE with

§ Conſideration of the Queriſts, page 24, &c.

with *Abraham*: Why? herein there is but little odds; both agree the Covenant of Grace was made with Man, tho' they don't juſtly hit on the ſame Perſon. That Author inſinuates that *Adam* was a publick Head in the ſecond Covenant, when he ſays it was *made with us in him.* Our Opponents very cordially join him here again, when in ſo many Words they affirm, 'That it was truly the 'Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* on BEHALF of 'himſelf, and both his *Natural* and *Spiritual* Seed, both '*Jews* and *Gentiles.*' Both agree that a mere Man was a *Publick Head* in the Covenant of Grace. Again, according to that Author's Plan, *there were ſome Mercies to be afforded by God, and ſome Duties to be performed by us.* Our Opponents ſtill join Hands with him, when they ſay, 'That *Abraham*'s Poſterity enjoy'd the SAME *Privileges*, '*Liberties*, and *Immunities* in the Church, as HIMSELF 'did, until by their *Degeneracy* ſome of them were broken 'off,' i. e. *for not doing their Duty on their Part, they forfeited their Right in the Covenant, and were excluded from the Number of the Covenanted People.* Which well agrees with that legal Author's Notion, of *ſome Duties to be performed by us.* Now, if our Opponents are right in their Notions about the Covenant of Grace, ſo was the Author of the Whole Duty of Man, and he muſt have been unjuſtly condemned; unleſs our Opponents think that ſame Doctrine to be Truth in them, which was condemned as an Error in him: But as he was unſound and corrupt in his Notions of the Covenant of Grace, ſo are our Opponents alſo; and their Notions deſerve to be ſeverely cenſured (if they had Juſtice done them) as being very corrupt, and highly diſhonourable to the *Plan* of Grace and Salvation: For according to them, a mere Man, as *Abraham* was, is beyond the Bounds of Truth and Soberneſs exalted: The Covenant of Grace ſadly miſrepreſented, and ſunk down below its proper Dignity and Glory, aſſerting it to be made with Man *on Behalf of others*, and ſo conſequently in itſelf ſubject to *Mutability*, as Man (the Party) was. And indeed God the Author, who putteth *no Truſt* in his Saints, muſt be ſuppoſed to act inconſiſtent with himſelf, to entruſt a feeble Creature as

Man

Man with ſuch weighty Concerns. Beſides, this Repreſentation ſerves to puff up carnal Creatures to the very Pinnacle of Pride, when their *Leaders* tell them that they and their Children are in the Covenant of Grace. In a Word, what a confus'd Notion of the Covenant of Grace is given by our Opponents, tending to lead People away from this fundamental Truth, *viz.* That the Covenant of Grace was made only with Chriſt (as a publick Head) *on Behalf of others*. Which glorious Truth is conſtantly and firmly to be maintain'd againſt all the falſe Inſinuations and corrupt Aſſertions of our *Oppoſers*.

Before I diſmiſs this Point, 'tis proper I ſhould take more particular Notice of this Aſſertion, *viz.* 'That it 'was truly the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* 'on *Behalf* of himſelf, and both his Natural and Spiritual 'Seed, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*.' Our Opponents muſt neceſſarily mean either *Typically* or *Actually*. But I can in no wiſe as yet perſuade myſelf they mean the Covenant of Grace was made with *Abraham*, on Behalf of his Seed, *Typically*, i. e. That *Abraham* was a *Typical* Head of Chriſt: The Covenant made with him a *Typical* Covenant of *that* made with Chriſt; becauſe ſuch a *Senſe* would make ſo much againſt themſelves in what they are now ſo much pleading for; and thereby they would do the Buſineſs for themſelves effectually at once, to prove *Abraham*'s Covenant to be repeal'd: For all will grant, that the Old Teſtament Types, Figures, and Shadows, were aboliſhed, when Chriſt the Antitype of them all was exhibited; and amongſt the reſt, *Abraham*'s Covenant, upon this Suppoſition. Then we muſt look for a new Covenant, as well as new Church Conſtitution, and new Ordinances, Commands, and Directions, ſuited to New Teſtament Times; which would cut off all their Plea for Infant Baptiſm, from *Abraham*'s Covenant. Therefore it remains that they mean the Covenant of Grace was *actually*, *truly*, and *properly*, *made* with *Abraham* on BEHALF of himſelf, and both his Natural and Spiritual Seed. 'Tis even ſurprizing that any Man who calls himſelf a *Chriſtian*, much more a *Miniſter*, would offer to publiſh in the Face of the World at this Time of Day, ſuch an abſurd *Poſi-*

tion, pregnant with intolerable Falſhoods: For Inſtance, 1. Let our Opponents ſhew what Man that was with whom God made the Covenant of Grace (as a publick Perſon) *on Behalf of others*, but with the God-Man, CHRIST JESUS.

2. Let them ſhew how *Abraham* could be a publick Head in the Covenant of Grace, without juſtling Chriſt out of his Office, or elſe hold two publick Heads in one Covenant, *equal* or *ſubordinate*; which would be monſtruouſly abſurd.

3. If the Covenant of Grace was made with *Abraham*, *on Behalf of his Natural and Spiritual* Seed, let them ſhew what Seed is allotted to Chriſt, or by what Name are they to be called? And further, what Concern can we ſuppoſe Chriſt to have with thoſe which belong to another Covenant Head? unleſs it be only to give them Strength to fulfil their DUTY on their Part, to prevent their *Degeneracy*.

4. Let them further declare to the World how the Covenant of Grace could be made with *Abraham* on Behalf of others, when he had no Grace to communicate or impart to them, which a publick Head ought to have?

It would be well for theſe Men who are ſo *briſk* to charge us with Errors, and holding dangerous Principles, firſt to caſt out the *Beam* out of their own Eyes before they attempt to caſt out the *Mote* out of ours. And if there were any hopes that they would ſee their *Miſtake* at all, it might be here in the *Foundation* of their whole Structure, where it is ſo viſible and palpable, that it is a Wonder how they do to get along without ſtumbling on it.

The pure Covenant of Grace was made with Chriſt only (as a Publick Head) on Behalf of others, long enough before *Abraham*'s Day; and it was reveal'd or manifeſted to *Adam*, *Abraham*, *David*, &c. in ſuch Ways and Meaſures as God thought proper: And not any of the Seed of *Abraham were intereſted* in it, by their being the Seed of *Abraham*, but by Regeneration, *Rom.* 4. 12. And as to *Abraham*'s carnal Seed, who liv'd and dy'd in a State of Nature, were they any farther impriviledg'd at the moſt

moſt, but only to partake of thoſe Ordinances appointed of God, during the Continuance of that dark, legal, and typical Diſpenſation? which is very different from their being in the Covenant of Grace: And if this is all that is intended by their being *viſible in the Covenant of Grace*, it will do our Opponents no great Service, becauſe that Adminiſtration is aboliſhed, together with the Ordinances then in Uſe: And we no where find it to be the Will of God, for Infants to be now baptized, as they were formerly circumcis'd. And thus accounting for it, our Opponents would prevent their falling into ſuch Abſurdities and Miſtakes about this Matter, as they generally do in the Way they go on.

After Mr. *F.* has cited ſome Places of Scripture which he imagines make for his Purpoſe, he enquires at the Cloſe of the Paragraph, 'Who can be ſo hardy as to ſay 'all theſe Scriptures are now repeal'd?' *Anſ.* We profeſs 'tis a juſt Debt we owe to the Publick, to obſerve that theſe Citations don't prove what they are here brought for; becauſe it ſeems by him, that Infants Church-Membership muſt ſtand or fall together with theſe Places of Scripture: So that if we be ſo *hardy* as to ſay that Infants are not in Covenant together with their believing Parents, we muſt conſequently affirm all theſe Texts to be *repealed*. Not at all; for 'tis manifeſt the *Places* which he refers to (unleſs *Deut.* 20. 9, 10) ſpeak of the ſpecial Work of God upon the Souls of his *Elect* People, or promiſe ſome peculiar and ſaving Benefits to them, pertaining only to the Spiritual Seed: But in none of them is it *aſſerted* or *implied* that the natural Offspring of Believers, as ſuch, are in the *pure Covenant of Grace*. Now, did we ever deny the *Seed* or *Offspring* of Believers, who are *choſen* and *called* of God. * *Deut.* 10. 15. *juſtified by Chriſt. Pſal.* 103. 17. Partakers of the Holy Ghoſt, *Iſa.* 44. 3. *Chap.* 59. 21. *Deut.* 30. 6. And this manifeſted by Good Works. *Exod.* 20. 6. Accompanied with God's ſpecial Care over them, &c. *Pſalm* 102. 28. *Prov.* 11. 21. To be in the Covenant of Grace as well as their believing

* Theſe are the Texts Mr. *F.* refers to, for Proof of Infants being in the Covenant of Grace.

lieving Parents? Nay, we are freely willing to baptize the Offspring of Believers upon God's fulfilling theſe Promiſes to them; becauſe it exactly agrees with the Tenor of the Commiſſion: *He that believeth is to be baptized.* And with the Practice of the Apoſtles; *Can any Man forbid Water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* Acts x. 47. What then would he prove from theſe Texts? Do theſe Places prove that the Seed or Offspring of Believers were any otherwiſe in the Covenant of Grace formerly, but by the ſpecial Operation of the Spirit of God upon their Souls? or any Thing as to Infants Right to Baptiſm now? No: Why then we have ſufficient Ground to deny the Aſſertions of our Opponents, without juſtling thoſe above-quoted Scriptures out of their Places. As to *Deut.* xxix. 10. it ſpeaks of the Covenant God made with the *Iſraelites* at their Return out of *Egypt*; which, beyond all Contradiction, is done away, and long ſince aboliſhed, *Jer.* xxxi. 31, 32. *Heb.* viii. 8. So that Mr. *F*'s Suggeſtion here, and his Aſſertion elſewhere, That we *Repeal* a great Part of the *Old Teſtament* which God has not *repeal'd*, is Groundleſs, and evidently a falſe Accuſation.

This leads me directly to conſider Mr. *F*'s Second general Head; which is, *Whether God has ever repealed the aforeſaid Appointment?*

Anſw. Having already clear'd our Way ſo far, all that is neceſſary for us here to affirm, is, That the *Jewiſh* Œconomy is at an End: That the Legal Adminiſtration is aboliſhed; or that the *Appointment* of God, for Infants to partake of any Ordinance, is repealed, or rather fulfilled.

That Infants are not now the Subjects of Baptiſm, as the *Jewiſh* Infants were of Circumciſion, is clear and manifeſt; for even at the very *Dawn* of the New Teſtament Adminiſtration (where we have the firſt Account of this ſacred Ordinance of Baptiſm) *John*, the Fore-runner of Chriſt, conſtantly required Faith, Repentance and Confeſſion of Sins in Order to Baptiſm. *Mark* i. 4, 5. John *did baptize in the Wilderneſs, and preach the Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of Sins. And there went*

out

out unto him all the Land of Judea, *and they of* Jeruſalem, *and were all baptized of him, in the River of* Jordan, confeſſing their Sins. Acts xix. 4. *Then ſaid* Paul, John *verily baptized with the Baptiſm of Repentance, ſaying unto the People, That they ſhould* believe *on him which ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus.* Mat. iii. 7, 8, 9. *But when he ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadducees come to his Baptiſm, he ſaid unto them, O Generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath to come? bring forth therefore Fruits meet for Repentance. And think not to ſay within yourſelves, we have* Abraham *to our Father*: Luke vii. 29, 30. *And all the People that heard him, and the Publicans juſtified God, being baptized with the Baptiſm of* John; *but the Phariſees and Lawyers rejected the Counſel of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized of him.* Hence it plainly appears, *John* the Baptiſt adminiſtred this Ordinance to none, but to thoſe who profeſſed their Faith, and made Confeſſion of their Sins. How groundleſs therefore is the Plea from Birth Priviledge to prove any One's Right to Baptiſm; for if the natural Offſpring of *Abraham* were not entituled to Baptiſm by it, how much leſs then are the Offspring of believing Gentiles, as ſuch, who are not the Seed of *Abraham* in any reſpect, to be baptized upon Account of their Parents Faith, Church-memberſhip, *&c.* ſeeing God has no where commanded it; nor have we any Inſtances of ſuch a Practice in Scripture. Mr. *F.* reaſons from *Mat.* iii. 8, 9. to this Purpoſe, *viz.* 'If Infants are intended 'in this Place, the Words will not only prove that they 'are cut off from Church-Priviledges, but that they will 'all certainly be damned who die in Infancy---But if 'they are not intended, to what Purpoſe do they bring 'the Text, ſince it will make nothing for them or a-'gainſt us, unleſs it ſpeak of Infants.---And tho' the 'Baptiſt deny'd the Ordinance to grown wicked Per-'ſons, yet his Words don't ſhew that he would not have 'baptized both religious Parents and their Seed.'---- *Anſw.* Why then did he conſtantly require Fruits meet for Repentance, in thoſe that came to be baptized of him? It is eaſy to gueſs how *mighty* ſuch kind of Reaſoning appears

pears to thoſe, who have been aways told that Believers Infants are to be baptized; but it is evident (notwithſtanding what is here advanced by Mr. *F.*) we have Room ſufficient left us, to *ſtake* down this invincible Truth, *viz.* That *John baptized none upon any other Conſideration, but upon Confeſſion of their Sins, and Profeſſion of Faith*---If he did, let our Opponents ſhew us the Scriptures which ſay that he baptized Believers Infants, as being in *Abraham*'s Covenant; or give us ſolid Reaſons if Infants were to be baptized, why they were not baptized the ſelf-ſame Day with their Parents, as *Abraham* and his Houſhold were circumciſed, *Gen.* xvii. 26, 27. or at leaſt ſoon after? Did *John* the Baptiſt ever *urge* the Parents to bring their Infant Seed, in theſe, or ſome like Words, 'All you Parents whom I have baptized, 'the Seal of the Covenant belongs to your Infant Seed alſo '(as our Opponents alledge) and you are to bring them 'to partake of it?' We deny any ſuch Injunction; prove them who can. Mr. *F.* † himſelf affirms, 'That 'thoſe Scriptures (wherein we find Faith and Repentance 'always required in Order to Baptiſm; and thoſe who 'were admitted to the Ordinance, were obliged to profeſs 'the ſame, and confeſs their Sins) are addreſſed *only* to 'grown Perſons, and not Infants.' Now ſeeing that in all the Places which ſpeak of *John*'s baptizing, theſe Qualifications were required, in order to Baptiſm; it eaſily follows, that there is no Ground to believe that he baptized any Infants; unleſs our Opponents will ſay, that they have as *good Ground* to believe what is *not written*, as that which is *written*; as they ſay, that they have as *good Ground* to baptize Infants, which is *not commanded*, as ‡ *Abraham* had to do what *was commanded*: And if ſo, methinks, both their *Faith* and *Practice* are very ill-grounded! The Caſe is juſt this, Either it was the *Will* and *Appointment* of God that *John* ſhould baptize Believers Infants, or it was not. If any ſay it was, they make that *holy* Man (who received his Miſſion immediately from God) a vile Tranſgreſſor of the divine Will and *Appointment*; but ſuch an horrid Crime was never charg'd up-

† Page 64, 65. ‡ Page 66.

upon him, who was ſo highly commended by Chriſt himſelf: Then it remains, that it was not the *Will* and *Appointment* of God, for him to baptize Believers Infants. And how much this falls ſhort of proving that God hath repeal'd the *aforeſaid* Appointment, I ſhall leave to our Opponents themſelves, to determine at their Leiſure.

'Another Scripture (ſays he) in which the Anabap-'tiſts *triumph*, (as tho' it proved a Repeal of the Cove-'nant made with *Abraham*) is, *Heb.* viii. 7, 8, 9, 10, 13. *For if the firſt Covenant had been faultleſs, then ſhould no Place have been ſought for the Second. For finding Fault with them, he ſaith, Behold, the Days come (ſaith the Lord) when I will make a New-Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and the Houſe of* Judah: *Not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers in the Day when I took them by the Hand to lead them out of the Land of* Egypt; *becauſe they continued not in my Covenant, and I regarded them not, ſaith the Lord. For this is the Covenant that I will make with the Houſe of* Iſrael *after thoſe Days, ſaith the Lord; I will put my Laws into their Mind, and write them in their Hearts: And I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be to me a People.---In that he ſaith, A New* Covenant, *he hath made the firſt Old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vaniſh away.*

Truly after all Mr. *F*'s *Clamour* about our *falſe Gloſſes* upon this Place, he hath left us *triumphing* as he found us; if any Thing, he has augmented the Cauſe of our *Triumph: We here ſee how forcible are right Words.* And if his Arguments have any Weight in them, he juſt proves what the Baptiſts never deny'd, *viz.* That all true Believers were in the Covenant of Grace made with Chriſt, before his Incarnation, as well as they be ſince; which is confirmed by that very Place he cites, *Deut.* xxx. 6. But this is not our preſent Buſineſs, for our Debate is not about the Spiritual Seed--Tho' our Opponents don't diſtinguiſh one Thing from another, as they ought to do. Mr. *F.* in the Proſecution of his Argument here in favour of his Practice, runs himſelf into inextricable Abſurdities; for his Drift is, to prove that this New-Covenant, mentioned in *Heb.* viii. is the ſame

that

that *Abraham*, *Moſes* and *Iſrael*, were under in the Wilderneſs; and then directly upon it, tells us, that by (New Covenant) we muſt underſtand, 'A new Adminiſtraion 'of the Covenant, which obtains under the New-Teſta-'ment.' Can he imagine then, that *Abraham*, *Moſes* and *Iſrael*, in the Wilderneſs, were under this New-Covenant, as he himſelf underſtands it? Does not he well know, that the New Covenant thus underſtood, took Place long after their Day? And why then would he go about to impoſe upon his unwary Readers, by pretending to prove that *Abraham*, *Moſes* and *Iſrael*, were under this New Covenant; which cannot be, according to his own Rule of Interpretation? And if he underſtands by New Covenant in *Heb.* viii. the New Adminiſtration, he might be ſure that we would follow his Rule, if it is good, and ſay, that by the Old Covenant we muſt underſtand, the old Adminiſtration which obtain'd under the Old Teſtament---which was made with *Iſrael* at their Return out of *Egypt*, and according to Mr. *F.* is the ſame that was made with *Abraham*---when he calls it *Abraham's or Iſrael's Covenant*: Now it is plain from this Place of Scripture, that the Old Covenant is aboliſhed, and ſo is Infants Church-membership, or their Right to Circumciſion, together with it---And Mr. *F*'s Buſineſs on this Head, if he had done any Thing to Purpoſe, was to ſhew us that Infants are the Subjects of Baptiſm under the New Covenant thus underſtood, which he has not done, and I am ſtill of the Mind never can; inſtead of going to prove that *Abraham* and *Iſrael* were under this New Covenant thus conſidered; for, according to his own Interpretation, every one muſt know his Aſſertion to be evidently falſe. And if it is ſo criminal in the Anabaptiſts (as he calls us) to urge this Place to ſerve their Purpoſe, Why did Mr. *F.* give us his helping Hand ſo cordially, to faſten us in our Belief that the aforeſaid Appointment is long ſince at an End? Let Mr. *F.* Anſwer us; Did he ever read of Infants Right to any Ordinance in the Church ſince the New Covenant (as he interprets it) took place? Upon the Whole, whether he will or no, the Baptiſts, according to his

own

own Rule, will come off, not only free from his *Cenſures*, but appear to be quite Right on this Head. And he muſt know, that he himſelf has rendered all his Reaſonings in Favour of his Practice from this Place, entirely inconcluſive.

Mr. *F.* ſays there is another Scripture which the Anabaptiſts ſadly abuſe to their Purpoſe, *viz. Rom.* ix. 7, 8. *Neither becauſe they are the Seed of* Abraham, *are they all Children; but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy Seed be called: That is, they which are the Children of the Fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promiſe are counted for the Seed.* After Mr. *F.* has propoſed ſeveral Queſtions from theſe Words, he gives us Liberty to try how we can ſuit it at all to our Purpoſe. With his Leave then we'll proceed, and I think the Buſineſs to be no difficult Taſk neither. 'Tis evident from theſe Words, that none, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, are counted the Spiritual Seed, but true Believers only. Now methinks all will grant, that the Infant Seed of Believing *Gentiles* are not *Abraham*'s fleſhly Seed; and Mr. *F.* in his Diſtinctions does not undertake to ſhew that they are his Spiritual Seed: Then it follows that the Infant Seed of *Gentile* Believers, as ſuch, are not the Seed of *Abraham* in any Reſpect at all. The Conſequence is then unavoidable, that they are not, as ſuch, the Subject of any Promiſe given to the Seed of *Abraham*. 'Tis therefore abundantly evident, that the Infants of *Gentile* Believers cannot be baptized by Vertue of any Promiſe given to the Seed of *Abraham*, becauſe they are not included in it: So that inſtead of abuſing this Scripture, our Inferences are natural and genuine, and muſt continue ſo, unleſs Mr. *F.* can make appear that the Infants of *Gentile* Believers are *Abraham*'s Seed in either of the two aforementioned Reſpects; for in a *Third* they can't be. Thus you ſee, that if Infants are to be baptized, it muſt be by ſome other Grant than the Charter given to the Seed of *Abraham*; for that does not reach them; and we find no Inſtitution for it in the Goſpel; therefore they are not the Subjects of Baptiſm. To imagine as our Opponents do, That Believers Infants are now to be baptized, as *Abraham*'s was cir-

cum-

cumciſed, is their great Miſtake; and 'tis ſtill to take that for granted, which ſhould be proven.

It ſeems Mr. *F.* was apprehenſive of ſome Difficulty in his Way, and accordingly endeavours to obviate ſome Objections. 'Will they ſay we have no Ground for a 'Judgment of Charity concerning the Spiritual Seed, 'but only a viſible credible Profeſſion of Faith. I an-'ſwer (ſaith he) was this the Method formerly uſed to 'judge of the Right of *Abraham*'s Seed to the imitating 'Seal of the Covenant? To this I reply: The Method they were to follow under the Law, was to circumciſe every Male Child at Eight Days old, according to the expreſs Order of God: (But they did not circumciſe them as the Spiritual Seed.) The Method now under the Goſpel, by no leſs Divine Authority, which we are cloſely to follow, is to baptize Perſons on Profeſſion of their Faith. Here lies his great Miſtake, that he would bring down the Order about Circumciſion to be imitated in the Caſe of Baptiſm. But who told him ſo? God hath never revealed this to be his Will, that Infants muſt now be baptized under the Goſpel Adminiſtration, as they were circumciſed under the legal Adminiſtration. And for our Opponents to run on to do any Thing as Service to God which he has not ordained, is juſt to lay themſelves under a Neceſſity of preparing an Anſwer to that ſolemn and cutting Queſtion, *Who hath required this at your Hands?* Let them ſhew that God requires Infants to be baptized, and we'll have done.

'2*dly*, I deny the Aſſertion (ſays he) that we have no 'other Ground of judging charitably who are the Spi-'ritual Seed, but only actual Profeſſion; for we have 'the Promiſe of God to Believers and their Seed, to 'judge by.' *Anſ.* Mr. *F.* ſeems very unhappy, that he is not himſelf fixed in his own Judgment in this Caſe, that he ſhould be obliged to put on different Shapes and Forms. If he has good Ground to judge charitably, that the Infant Seed of Believers are the Spiritual Seed, his Diſtinction at the Beginning of a two-fold being in the Covenant of Grace, is quite uſeleſs. That when he ſpeaks of Church Members and their Seed, as being all in the Covenant---

He

He does not mean, that they are all in it ſavingly, but only in the Sight of the viſible Church. But in this Place he declares, that he hath Ground of charitable Judgment, that the Infant Seed of Believers are the Spiritual Seed---I believe none will deny but the Spiritual Seed are *ſavingly* in the Covenant of Grace. And ſo our Objection will ſtill ſtand in Force, 'That if Believers 'and their Seed are all in Covenant [thus] they will all 'be ſaved.' 'Tis Pity he had not found this Ground of charitable Judgment ſooner, and ſpared himſelf the Trouble of his Diſtinctions, and us the Remarks on them. By the Way, ſeeing the Scripture does not declare that the Infants of Church-members, as ſuch, are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, Mr. *F.* is deſired to obſerve, that his Judgment in the Caſe, is not a ſufficient Proof of this Matter.

'Nor can their Argument (ſays he) from *Gal.* iii. 16. 'conclude againſt us---The Words are, *Now to* Abra-'ham *and his Seed were the Promiſes made. He ſaith not,* '*And to Seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed,* '*which is Chriſt.* If this Promiſe is made to Chriſt perſonally, then it will prove that no Believer is counted 'for the Seed, but Chriſt alone----Therefore it muſt 'have been made to Chriſt myſtical, or as Head of the 'viſible Church; and then it will extend to all Be-'lievers in him, and alſo to their Seed; for they were 'never caſt out of the Church, for ought that yet ap-'pears.'--- *Anſ.* One might think that the very mentioning of this Argument, would be a ſufficient Refutation of it. Does not the Apoſtle very particularly guard againſt ſuch a Notion? when he ſays the Promiſes were *not made unto Seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy Seed, which is Chriſt.* 'Tis evident the Promiſes were made primarily to Chriſt perſonal, *for in all Things he muſt have the Preeminence.* Col. i. 18. and ſo God gives him *for a Covenant of the People,* and *all the Promiſes in him,* Iſa. xlii. 6. 2 Cor. i. 20. *and for a Head over all Things to the Church.* Eph. i. 22. *Which is his Body.* This is according to the very Tenor of the Apoſtles Argument, *Gal.* iii. 22. *But the Scripture hath concluded all under*

Sin, that the Promiſe by Faith of Jeſus Chriſt, might be given *to them that* believe.

2. But what a wild Way of Arguing does Mr. *F.* uſe here! 'Believers Infants are Church-members--Therefore 'the Promiſe extends to them alſo.' Let him ſpeak out; Will Church-membership entitle any to the Promiſe of Juſtification, *Gal.* iii. 8. Of the Holy Ghoſt. *v.* 14. Of Adoption, *Chap.* iv. 5, 6. And of the eternal Inheritance, *Chap* iv. 7. Do the Promiſes of theſe Spiritual Bleſſings *extend* to Believers and their Infant Seed, as ſuch? Or are any of the Seed of Believers entitled to theſe Bleſſings by Birth-priviledge? Let Mr. *F.* ſhew where God hath promiſed theſe Spiritual Bleſſings ſhould be entail'd upon any fleſhly Line, *John* i. 13. 'Tis really marvelous that our Opponents will wreſt Texts of Scripture which ſpeak particularly, and only of the Spiritual Seed, or true Believers, to countenance their Fancies about the Right of their Infant Seed to Church-membership, *&c.* If they do thus thro' Ignorance, and for want of knowing better, they are much to be pitied, and ought to be timely inſtructed; but if wilfully againſt Light and Knowledge to ſerve their Turn, they muſt be very unfit Men to handle the Word of God. 2 *Cor.* ii. 17. *Chap.* iv. 2.

'The Seed of Believers (ſays he) were never caſt 'out of the Church, for ought that yet appears.' *Anſ.* I don't know how it ſhould appear that Infants were caſt out of the New-Teſtament Church, when it does not appear that they were ever in it. For as Mr. *Neſs* worthily obſerves, † 'The Perſons who were Materials, 'and the conſtituting Members of this *firſt* conſtituted 'Goſpel Church, are deſcribed by their Names, Number and Holy Exerciſes, in *Acts* i. 12, 13, 14, 15, '*&c.*' And who were they? Why a Company of profeſſing Believers, and none elſe: Theſe were the Materials of the firſt conſtituted Goſpel Church. And when we trace the Account of its Growth and Progreſs, we ſtill find that none but profeſſing Believers were added unto it, *Acts* ii. 41, 47. *Chap.* iv. 4. As we do not read of any Infants in this Church at *Jeruſalem*, neither

† Hiſt. and Myſt. of the Bible, Vol. 4. Page 336.

do

do we read of any Infants that were Members of any of the primitive Churches planted by the Apoſtles, thro' the whole Courſe of their Miniſtry---What ſignifies it then for our Opponents to harp upon this String, That Infants were never caſt out of the Church, when they have never ſhewn, that they were ever in the viſible Church, under the New-Teſtament Diſpenſation; and it lies ſtill at their Door to ſhew that they were, if they can---And not put us off with what was done under the legal Adminiſtration---For the *Jewiſh* OEconomy is long ſince at an End; and we expect New-Teſtament Proof for what pertains to a New-Teſtament viſible Church.

Again, Where in Scripture do our Opponents read of that Notion which they call *the* † *Pale of the Church*? wherewith they colour their Fancy for half-way Members, *i. e.* Members (as their Infants are) not fully in their Church, nor yet in the wide World, but within the Pale of their viſible Church; probably in their Church-Yard---Somewhere in the Middle between their Church and the World---Did Mr. *F.* ever hear of any ſuch Members in Apoſtolic Times? I believe not, becauſe ſuch a pretty Fancy has been hatch'd long ſince that Day; and what is it good for, unleſs it be to pave the Way to ſome unknown *Middle* Region for them in the other World too, if they depart in ſuch Circumſtances? Did Mr. *F.* ever read that there were ſuch Members as their Children are, either under the Legal, or Goſpel Adminiſtration? Upon the Whole, this Text is ſo far from concluding for them, that it is a Wonder how Mr. *F.* could have the Confidence to ſay it does.

'*Abraham*'s Bleſſing was not only to himſelf perſonally, but alſo to his Seed: And this very Bleſſing is 'come on the *Gentiles* through Chriſt; therefore it 'muſt come on their Seed too. *Gal.* iii. 14.' *Anſw.* Our Opponents would fain find ſomething from the Scripture to favour their Argument, when nothing can be more contrary to it. For the Bleſſing of *Abraham*, which the Scripture aſſerts to have come on the *Gentiles* through Chriſt, is Juſtification by Faith, *Rom.* iv. 11. The Gift

† Page 49.

of the Holy Ghoſt, *Gal.* iii. 14. Adoption, *&c. Gal.* iii. 26. Spiritual Bleſſings, pertaining only to the Spiritual Seed, even true Believers, *Gal.* iii. 29. as I have already ſhown. Are the carnal Seed of believing *Gentiles*, as ſuch, Partakers of theſe ſpiritual Benefits? If not, how can our Opponents ſay that *Abraham*'s Bleſſing is come on them, when the Aſſertion is entirely falſe? And what does it avail them to call the *Jewiſh Church-Memberſhip in the fleſhly Line*, by the Name of *Abraham*'s Bleſſing, when the Apoſtle does not call it ſo, neither aſſerts any ſuch Thing to have come on the *Gentile* Infants through Chriſt? Indeed to do as our Opponents, to apply what belongs to the Spiritual Seed to the Fleſhly, *is not to explain, but to confound and contradict Scripture with a Witneſs.*

Again, might not the Promiſe to *Abraham*, that he ſhould be the Father of many Nations, and that Kings ſhould come out of him, *Gen.* xvii. 5, 6. be called *Abraham*'s Bleſſing, or a great Part of it? And is there any ſuch Bleſſing come upon every *Gentile* Believer? If there is, let our Opponents ſhew it: If not, does not the Bleſſing of *Abraham* come curtail'd? Was it not a Bleſſing to *Abraham* to have the Promiſe of the Land (from the River of *Egypt*, unto the great River *Euphrates*) to his Seed? *Gen.* xv. 18. And is this very Bleſſing come on the *Gentiles* and their Seed too, in the FORM or FULNESS of it? Will our Opponents ſay it is, and proceed to ſhape ſome bloody *Engine* or another (like the ſolemn League and Covenant) with Hands lifted up to Heaven, SWEAR *to uſe their* Endeavours to extirpate or root out all from ſome Part of the Earth, but themſelves? Or will they ſay it is not? Does not *Abraham*'s Bleſſing then come on the *Gentiles* curtail'd? Again, was it not *Abraham*'s Bleſſing to have the Seal of the Covenant (ſo called) adminiſtred to all the Males born in his Houſe, or bought with Money of any Stranger, *Gen.* xvii. 12. And is this come on the *Gentiles?* If it is, Why don't our Opponents baptize thoſe who are born in their Houſe; and the Servants or Slaves they buy with their Money? Or elſe ſhow us when their Right was repeal'd; or whe-

ther

ther *Chriſt's coming has diminiſhed* their *Privileges, and narrow*'d *the Door of the Church?* If not; does not *Abraham*'s Bleſſing come on the *Gentiles* curtail'd? Once more; Was it not *Abraham*'s Bleſſing, to be ſet a-part, as a ſpecial Channel, through whoſe Loins God would bring the promiſed Seed (Chriſt) into the World; and his Poſterity ſeparated likewiſe, to be a peculiar People, from among whom he ſhould be ſo brought forth? And is this come on the *Gentiles?* If not; does not *Abraham*'s Bleſſing come on them curtail'd?

If theſe Things were only *Temporal*, and peculiar to *Abraham* and his Seed, ſo ſay we of Infants Right to any Ordinance, that it was only during the *Jewiſh* Œconomy. If *Abraham*'s Bleſſing comes full and uncurtail'd on the *Gentiles*, without theſe; ſo ſay we without the Notion of Infants Church Membership; and let our Opponents prove the contrary when they are *able*.

The Sum is this, That the Bleſſing of *Abraham* which the Scripture aſſerts to have come on the Believing *Gentiles* through Chriſt, is Juſtification by Faith, with all the ſpecial and ſaving Benefits of the New Covenant which do accompany it: For they which be of Faith, are bleſſed with faithful *Abraham*. *Gal.* iii. 9. i. e. Juſtified as he was. Upon the Whole, I can't but firmly conclude that the aforeſaid Appointment is at an End, as well as many other Appointments under the *Jewiſh* or legal Diſpenſation.

There is no Neceſſity I ſhould dwell long upon what Mr. *F.* calls the *Devices of the Anabaptiſt* to prove the Repeal of the aforeſaid Appointment: However, I may juſt take a curſory View of ſome Things he mentions. 'They aſſert, (ſays he) that *Abraham*'s Covenant was mixt.' Do they ſo? then 'tis in Reſpect of Temporal and Eternal Things. But who amongſt them ever came up to Mr. *Finley*'s Notion of Mixture in *Abraham*'s Covenant? *viz.* That Perſons enjoy'd the ſame Privileges, Liberties and Immunities, in the Church as *Abraham* himſelf did, until by their *Degeneracy* they were broken off.

2. 'They join *Abraham*'s Covenant with the Law 'given on *Sinai*, and argue that it was a rigorous

'Covenant of Works, and conſequently is aboliſhed.' If he means by this Charge, the Law given on *Sinai*, in a ſtrict Senſe, *i. e.* the moral Law only, 'tis very unlikely we ſhould join *Abraham*'s Covenant with it, in order to prove it to be aboliſhed, when we firmly believe the Moral Law itſelf is not. But if we join *Abraham*'s Covenant with the *Sinai* Covenant, conſidered largely; Mr. *F.* does the Buſineſs for us, to ſhew that *Abraham*'s Covenant is aboliſhed, when he calls it *Abraham*'s or *Iſrael*'s Covenant; for all muſt grant, that the Covenant made with the *Iſraelites* at their Return out of *Egypt*, is aboliſhed: And we ſhall leave him to debate the Matter with the inſpired Penman. *Heb.* 8.

Again, 'Either the carnal *Jews* miſtook the Deſign 'of God in giving the Law, or they did not. If they 'did miſtake it, then he did not give it to be a Covenant 'of Works; for this they thought it to be when they 'ſought Juſtification by it.' *Anſw.* The Argument ſeems to turn out thus: But the carnal *Jews* did miſtake it; therefore the Law was given to be a Covenant of Grace. Then certainly the *Jews* were in the Right to ſeek Juſtification by the Law; tho' the Apoſtle ſays, That *as many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curſe*, Gal. iii. 11. 'Tis ſurprizing that our Opponents can't ſee that the Law (as a rigorous Covenant of Works) is ſubſervient to the Goſpel, by convincing Men of Sin, and condemning for Sin; without aſſerting it to be the Thing itſelf, to which it is ſubſervient, *Rom.* iii. 20. *Gal.* iii. 12. 23.

And as impertinent is Mr. *F*'s Queſtion concerning *Paul*'s circumciſing *Timothy*, *viz.* 'Did he bind *Timothy* 'under a Covenant of Works? *i. e.* by Circumciſing him. *Anſ.* When *Paul* circumciſed *Timothy*, Circumciſion was then abrogated, and was nothing at all. * *Paul* who became all Things to all Men, adminiſtred this antiquated Ceremony to *Timothy*, that he might not offend the *Jewiſh* Converts, *Acts* xvi. 3. But for Mr. *F.* then to argue from this Inſtance, when Circumciſion was a mere abrogated Ceremony, to confirm what he is upon, is intolerably Abſurd and Ridiculous. Mr.

* Vide Pool in Loc.

Mr. *F.* at the Cloſure of this general Head, ſwells and vapours exceedingly, as if he had come off entirely a Conqueror forever. 'I CHALLENGE (ſays he) all my Op-'ponents in this Point, to prove the Repeal of God's 'Gracious Grant, or elſe let them forever ceaſe to cavil 'at us. I demand the Text of Scripture that ſays, God 'will not now ſtand to the Charter given to *Abraham* and 'his Poſterity, *&c.* And he ſuppoſes if any ſhouldundertake this Taſk, he muſt be One endued with ſome *ſuper Angelic Strength*, to go through with this Buſineſs. But may we venture to enquire what is this weighty Work, this mighty Taſk? Is it to ſhew that Chriſt the promiſed Seed of *Abraham*, is not come in the Fleſh? No; this is not queſtioned. Is it to ſhew that God will not be the God of *Abraham*, and his Spiritual Seed? No; this is owned on all Sides: What then? Why it is to prove that the Carnal Seed of *Abraham* are not viſibly in the Covenant, or that Infants Church-Membership is at an End. Is this the great Taſk? Is this all? Why it can be done without either going to Heaven for the Strength of *Cherubims*, or gathering all the Force of his Opponents upon Earth to diſpatch the Buſineſs. Even any Child in Religion, with the Aſſiſtance of God's Word, is an equal Match to this ſuppoſed impoſſible Work. Firſt then, obſerve the Charter given to *Abraham* and his Poſterity, is *broke*. Here is a Text of Scripture for him. *Jer.* xxxi. 32. *Which my Covenant they* BRAKE, *altho' I was an Huſband unto them ſaith the Lord.* Heb. viii. 9. *They continued not in my Covenant, and I* REGARDED THEM NOT, *ſaith the Lord.* Who broke this Charter? Why *Abraham's* Poſterity. Who were rejected and diſregarded? Not the Spiritual Seed but the Carnal; and the Charter is thrown by as old Parchment out of Date. *Heb.* viii. 13. HE HATH MADE THE FIRST OLD. And there was a new Charter given, every Way better than the Old, and *not according to it. Behold the Days come (ſaith the Lord) when I will make a new Covenant with the Houſe of* Iſrael, *and the Houſe of* Judah: *Not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers in the Day when I took them by the Hand to lead them out of the*

Land of Egypt, *becauſe they continued not in my Covenant, and* I regarded them not, *ſaith the Lord.* Heb. viii. 8. 9.

Let Mr. *F.* ſhew if *he can*, that Believer's Infants are now to be baptized by Vertue of this new Charter, as the *Jewiſh* Infants were to be circumciſed by the Order of God of old: But as this is impoſſible for him to do, let him (according to his own Direction) *forever ceaſe to cavil at us*, when we ſtill reject his *Proof* for Infants Baptiſm, from their antiquated Right to Circumciſion, which is as *frivolous* as it is *abſurd.*

If it be objected, that the above cited Text means only the two diſtinct Adminiſtrations, I would enquire, Was the Lord married to the People of the *Jews*, or called their Huſband, only upon the Account of the former Adminiſtration? If ſo, then it follows that no more is to be underſtood by the whole Nation of the *Jews* and their Seed's being in Covenant (true Believers excepted) than that they were only the Subjects of Ordinances under the former Adminiſtration. Now that Adminiſtration being aboliſhed, ſo is Infants Church-Membership together with it: There is therefore no Ground to ſupport the Notion of our Opponents, ſeeing there is no mention made of it in the New Charter, or Goſpel Adminiſtration; nor any Inſtances or Examples of it in the Apoſtolic Churches.

From what hath been obſerved, we may ſee where Infants Church-membership (ſuch as it was) ended in the *Jewiſh* national Church: Now the great Stone which ſhould be turn'd, is to ſhew us when Infants Church-membership began in the Chriſtian Church, under the New Teſtament Diſpenſation. Let Mr. *F.* read the Hiſtory of the Churches of *Judea*, *Galilee*, *Samaria*, *&c.* and bring us ſuch unheard of Tidings---That the Infants of Believers were baptized, and admitted Church-members---Nay, the ſacred Records give us a quite different Relation of Things---*viz. Thoſe who heard the Goſpel, and received the Word gladly, were baptized---And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtle's Doctrines and Fellowſhip, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers*, Acts ii. 37, 40, 41, 42. *Chap.* viii. 12. with ſuch like; which gives

gives us to underſtand, that the Members of the New-Teſtament Churches were only adult Perſons, who were alſo capable to be found active in the New-Teſtament Worſhip. To ſay there were Infants admitted into thoſe Churches, tho' it is not mentioned, is to take for granted, what ſhould be proven; and ſo nothing at all to the Purpoſe. Sure they are got ſomewhere beyond the Proteſtant Line, who would impoſe on the World, the Neceſſity of believing Things unwritten: Nay the Attempt is quite weak and ridiculous; and yet in this Caſe, it muſt be our Opponents great Refuge. What ill-ſhaped Inſtruments muſt theſe Gentlemen have to work with, who conclude there were Infants baptized, and taken into the Apoſtolical Churches, when the Scripture ſhews no ſuch Thing. Now unleſs our Opponents could roll this Stone over, and give us a Scriptural Account of Infants Church-memberſhip, under the New Teſtament Diſpenſation, they do juſt nothing at all to the Purpoſe, with their great Noiſe and Buſtle about the Covenant, *&c.*---They may ſtill expect to find us rejecting their *fineſt* Gloſſes, and ſtrongeſt Conſequences, as frivolous, without any convincing Force, or Weight at all, in the preſent Caſe; neither can they thereby prove Matters of Fact. They muſt know alſo, that we are beforehand with them in this Point, for we can tell them the Riſe, Progreſs, and End of Infants Church-memberſhip in the *Jewiſh* Church, to be from the Return of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*; or at the furtheſt, from the Days of *Abraham*, to Chriſt's putting an End to the *Jewiſh* Œconomy. And to uſe Mr. *F*'s vulgar Phraſe, *I Challenge him*, or any other, to ſhew that Infants were the Subjects of any Ordinance, or Church-members, by *Divine Authority*, ever ſince. Which leads me directly to conſider his Third Aſſertion, *viz.* 'That God has actually renewed and confirmed the aforeſaid Appointment, under the New Teſtament Diſpenſation.' Well, if this is made good, undoubtedly the Controverſy is forever at an End: But how Mr. *F.* has diſcharg'd himſelf on this Head, ſhall be our preſent Search and Enquiry. In his Entrance upon this Head, he preſents us with

with a fine Flouriſh--' Here, ſays he, I am got into a large ' Field, where I have a Variety of Arguments from ' Scripture'---But he muſt know we are not concern'd with the *Number* and *Variety* of his Arguments, but with their *Weight* and *Solidity*; for he has only order'd us to examine them by *Weight*, and not by Number.

Here, by the Way, his Repetition of the ſame Things, obliges me again to obſerve, that this Grand Miſtake runs all along thro' this Performance, *viz.* That the Covenant of Grace was made with Man---The Abſurdities of this Notion I have ſhown above---And here he adds a Text of Scripture out of *Gal.* iii. 8. which is as remote to his Buſineſs, as any he had cited before---This ſpeaks that the Goſpel was preached to *Abraham*---Who queſtions that? Don't we always ſay, that the Covenant of Grace was revealed to the Fathers long before Chriſt came in the Fleſh, and that true Believers were intereſted in that Covenant? but what is this to the Point in Hand?---Indeed to cite Numbers of Scriptures, when they don't prove what they are brought for, ſerves for nothing but to make the *poor unthinking Populace* imagine that his Performance is well proved, when 'tis no ſuch Thing.

' And ſince the Infants of Church-members were once ' in it, they are in it ſtill'---This does not follow, becauſe 'tis confeſſed, that thoſe who were in Covenant, may be broken off---I can't underſtand how that Covenant can be everlaſting, which does not everlaſtingly ſecure all thoſe in it from falling away. How abſurd ſoever Mr. *F.* may think our Expoſition of *Gal.* iii. 14. to be---We muſt abide by it, 'till we find a better: We ſay that the Bleſſing of *Abraham* which the Apoſtle has there in View, comes wholly on the believing Gentiles thro' Chriſt--And at the ſame Time deny that the Holy Apoſtle meant any thing of Infants Right to Church-memberſhip---For we are told in the ſame Verſe, what the Apoſtle meant by *Abraham*'s Bleſſing, *viz.* ' The ' Promiſe of the Spirit;' whoſe Work and Office it is to take the Things of Chriſt, and ſhew them to the Elect of God. We are alſo informed in the ſame Verſe,

how

how this Bleſſing is received, not by Birth-right, but thro' Faith. Is it not a marvellous Thing, that our Opponents will labour to prove their Aſſertion of Infants Right to Church Privileges, from ſuch Places as this, which ſpeak particularly and deſignedly of the Spiritual Seed--- 'Tis manifeſt that the Apoſtle's Scope in the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*, was to reclaim thoſe People from *Judaiſm*---There is not a Word in all the Apoſtle's Arguments, that refers to the Infant Seed of Church-members, as our Opponents urge--Nor any Thing that looks that Way, throughout the whole Epiſtle. Further, this Bleſſing here ſpoken of, did not belong to the *Jews* themſelves, as the natural Offspring of *Abraham*, but on the Account of their Regeneration, or New-Birth, *Rom.* iv. 12. With what Face then can Mr. *F.* conclude that the Gentiles are not Heirs of the Promiſe, if their Infant Seed are rejected? Juſt as if their Infants Church-membership (that inſipid Thing) was the *Chief*, the ALL, intended by the Bleſſing, which the Apoſtle mentions.

The firſt Text of Scripture which Mr. *F.* advances, as tho' it proved the Right of Believers Infants to Church-membership under the Goſpel Diſpenſation, is *Acts* ii. 39. *For the Promiſe is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.* If there is ſuch a Thing to be found, as the powerful Force of Education, the ſtrong Byas of a Mind pre-poſſeſs'd with an Opinion, it may be ſeen in the Attempts of our Antagoniſts to apply this Scripture to their Purpoſe; as I hope to make evidently appear. Mr. *F.* Gloſſeth on this Place, as if he expected his bare Word would ſtand for undoubted Proof---'If the Parents (ſays he) repent, they 'ſhall be baptized; and ſince their Children are in the 'ſame Promiſe, they ſhall be baptized too; as they had 'the former initiating Seal of the Covenant, *viz.* Circumciſion, ſo ſhall they have the latter, *viz.* Baptiſm.' I deny his Aſſertion, *that the Baptiſts ſeek to confine this Promiſe, to intend only miraculous Gifts:* And I believe this Gentleman is much unacquainted with our main Strength, when he ſays, it is this, *viz.* that *we affirm the laſt Words of the Text to be a Limitation of the former.*

But

But to proceed ; The Words, according to Mr. *F.* muſt be thus paraphras'd, *The Promiſe of Remiſſion of Sins, of the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, and Salvation is to you Parents, on your Repentance, and complying with the preſent Call, and in ſo doing, your Children are entitled alſo to Baptiſm, &c.* But,

1. The Promiſe here is the ſame both to the Parents and Children ; if it is of the Pardon of Sin, and Gift of the Holy Ghoſt to the Parents, 'tis ſo to the Children. 'Tis ſtrange that Mr. *F.* who charges us with *Curtailing Abraham's Bleſſing*, ſhould himſelf *Curtail this* Promiſe---That the Parents were to have Remiſſion of Sins, *&c.*---But all that is pleaded for their poor Infants, is that they were to enjoy outward Privileges, to be baptized--Is there any Room for this Diſtinction in the Text ? Does the Apoſtle make any ſuch Difference ? Not at all. For whatever the Promiſe contains, and is to the Parents, ſuch it is, no more nor no leſs, to the Children : 'Tis evident that the Expoſition of our Opponents, tends to faſten a Gloſs upon the Apoſtle's Words, which is falſe ; for if Children are intereſted in this Promiſe, by Virtue of their Parents Intereſt in it, then it follows they have Remiſſion of Sins, the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, and Salvation, upon the Account of their Parents Repentance and Faith--Which is not true : Becauſe theſe are the Things contain'd in the Promiſe, and the Promiſe is the ſame to the Children as it is to the Parents. Or to ſuppoſe that by Children here, we muſt underſtand Infants, and that Church-membership belongs to them at Preſent, but theſe Spiritual Bleſſings were not to be conferred upon them 'till afterward, would be contrary to Mr. *F*'s own Way of arguing--That the Promiſe is expreſſed in the preſent Tenſe.

In the Way he goes on, he muſt neceſſarily fall on one of theſe Abſurdities, either, 1. That the ſame Promiſe is not the ſame, or of the ſame Fulneſs to Children, as it is to the Parents ; or, 2. That Children are entitled to Pardon of Sin, the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, and Salvation, upon their Parents Faith ? Or elſe, 3. Be obliged to own that which he has condemned in Reſpect of the Tenſe uſed here.

2. Seeing

2. Seeing the Goſpel is not preach'd to Infants, neither do the Precepts of it enjoin Repentance upon Infants as a Duty, in that Capacity: Let Mr. *F.* ſhew the Scriptural Grounds of his Practice, or even the Reaſonableneſs of his Opinion, that Infants are capable of giving Obedience to God in Baptiſm, the ſecond Step here expreſs'd in the Context as a Duty, when they are not capable of the firſt, *viz.* Repentance; or ſhew his Authority for his perverting the Apoſtle's Words, to countenance Infant Baptiſm: For inſtead of reading *Repent and be baptized*, he muſt always read the Scripture backward, 'Be *bap-* 'tized and repent,' whenever he has to do with baptizing of Infants, contrary to the Apoſtle's Words, and the whole Tenor of the Word of God. Methinks our Opponents don't diſtinguiſh between Promiſes and Commands, in the Way they argue; 'tis certain, a Promiſe can never make that to be a Duty, which is not commanded; and therefore, to urge the baptizing of Infants from this Place, to be a Duty (which God has no where ordered or commanded) muſt needs be a ſad abuſe of this Promiſe.

3. There is not any Thing in the Text or Context which leads us to conclude, that by (Children) here we muſt underſtand Infants, but altogether to the Contrary: Tho' Mr. *F.* ſays, 'The Word *Teknois*, ſignifies an 'Offſpring, tho' it were a Minute old.' But will he preſume to ſay, this Word ſignifies an Offſpring of ſuch an Age *only*? † 'It is a general Word, which in Scrip- 'ture, and other Writers, is uſed to ſet forth all Sort of 'Children, of what Sex, of what Age, of what Degree 'ſoever they be.' And ſo we find it here abundantly in our Favour, comparing this 39th Verſe of the 2d Chapter of the *Acts*, with the 17th Verſe of the ſame Chapter, where theſe, who are here called Children, are there called Sons and Daughters, grown to ſuch Years of Maturity, as to receive the Holy Ghoſt by the hearing of Faith, and to Propheſy; which does not very well ſuit with Mr. *F*'s Deſign of Reſtricting the *Word* in this Place, as

† Leigh.

as tho' it intended only an Infant of a Minute old, or at moſt one very young. The ſtated Order of God, whereby People receive the Holy Ghoſt, is by hearing the Word. *Gal.* iii. 2. *Acts* x. 44. *Rom.* x. 17. 2 *Cor.* iii. 8. And in the Uſe of appointed Means and Ordinances, to receive further Meaſures of the Spirit. Now ſeeing this is a Promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt to Children, as well as to the Parents, there is no Room to conclude that the Apoſtle meant Infants who are incapable to receive the Holy Ghoſt by hearing the Word; but Children of riper Years: For what is here ſpoken, is according to the ſtated Order of God in the Miniſtry of the Word, wherein *Peter* and the Apoſtles were then Exerciſing. Nor will our Arguings on this Head, afford our Opponents Room to cavil, that we caſt away Infants utterly;---becauſe we are not ſpeaking of what God does with Infants, but of his Order in the Goſpel Miniſtry, with thoſe come to Years of Underſtanding. Neither can I find what thoſe Notes are, whereby Mr. *F.* can ſo plainly diſtinguiſh theſe Children from ſuch as were come to Years.---By what is found in Scripture concerning them, (or the Meaning of the Apoſtle in theſe Words) they are plainly diſtinguiſh'd to be ſuch who were advanc'd to Years of Maturity, that they were capable to hear the Word, and to receive the Spirit by hearing of it; which is an Evidence of the Truth which we alledge,---and ſerves to ſhew the Invalidity of what Mr. *F.* urges,---that theſe Children were join'd with their Parents, therefore they muſt be Infants.

4. If thoſe Children here mentioned, were in Covenant, in the Manner our Opponents plead for by Vertue of this Promiſe, ſo alſo were the unconverted Gentiles; for the Promiſe runs exactly the ſame to them in the preſent Tenſe, as it does to the Children, *viz.* 1. The Promiſe is to you. 2. The Promiſe is to your Children. 3. The Promiſe is to them afar off: But if the unconverted Gentiles were not, neither were Infants; for the ſame Reaſon holds, take it which Way you will. 'Tis a little odd, that this Gentleman who pretends to underſtand Grammar, ſhould be guilty of ſuch a Grammatical

Blun-

Blunder himſelf, in ſo plain a Caſe, as to aſſert, that 'when the Apoſtle ſpeaks to the *Jews*, he ſpeaks in the 'preſent Tenſe; but, mentioning the Gentiles, he ſpeaks 'in the *future* Tenſe.' As the Apoſtle does not ſay the the Promiſe *is* to you, and *ſhall* be to your Children, ſo neither does he ſay it *ſhall* be to the Gentiles; but the Promiſe is to them afar off. If Mr. *F.* has Liberty to alter the Verb (underſtood) in the laſt Clauſe from the preſent Tenſe to the future, we deſire to know why we may not have the like Liberty to change the ſame Verb (underſtood) from the preſent Tenſe to the future too;---and ſo make the Words run thus:---The Promiſe is to you, and ſhall be to your Children, *&c.* How could Mr. *F.* help himſelf, but only ſay, that we were like him, guilty of falſe Conſtruction.---But to ſet Mr. *F.* in the Right; 'tis not the Promiſe that is expreſſed in the future Tenſe, but the Work of God in *calling* the Gentiles; and the Apoſtle ſhews who among the Gentiles the Promiſe reſpected: *Even as many as the Lord our God* ſhall *call.* And conſidering what the Promiſe was, *viz.* Remiſſion of Sins, the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, and Salvation, neither of three Parties (Parents, Children, or Gentiles) were Partakers of it, or intereſted in it, but according to the Order of the Goſpel, *Acts* xx. 21. Hence Mr. *F*'s Queſtion 'If no ſpecial Privileges be deſign'd for the Children of Believers in this Text, for what End are they join'd with their Parents in the Promiſe?' is eaſily anſwered, *viz.* for the ſame End that the Gentiles were join'd with *both* in this Promiſe, *i. e.* to be ſaved through Faith in Chriſt Jeſus.

We have compared this Place with *Gen.* xvii. 7. (according to Mr. *F*'s Deſire) and can do no leſs than declare to the World, that we can't behold the Agreement at all in the Light our Opponents repreſent it; unleſs 1. all *Abraham*'s fleſhly Seed were Partakers of Remiſſion of Sins, and of the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt; or 2. Unleſs the Promiſe here is not the ſame to the Children as it is to the Parents. 'Till either of theſe Things are made appear, we can't ſee *any* Reſemblance theſe Places

have

have to each other, that will ſuit the preſent Purpoſe of our Adverſaries at all.

5. And laſtly: That which fully overthrows all that our Opponents have raiſed from this Scripture in Favour of their Practice, and which will forever render all their future Endeavours uſeleſs and invalid on this Head, is the Account which the Scripture gives us of this Affair. *Acts* ii. 41, 42. *Then* they *that* gladly *received his Word* were baptized: *and the ſame Day there were added unto them about Three Thouſand Souls. And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine and Fellowſhip, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers.* Here is no mention of any baptized, but thoſe who received the Goſpel gladly: Not a Word of any Infants baptized. I feel in my Soul a Pity for my Opponents, that they will ſo ſtrenuouſly maintain a Practice for which there is no Command; nor any Hint, Inſtance, or Example of it in the Word of God.

Here I would juſt aſk them, what ſignifies it for them to urge this Place of Scripture to ſerve a Purpoſe it was not originally deſign'd for, as is abundantly manifeſt from the Verſes before and after? When there is no Record of Infant Baptiſm in Scripture, what can any One conclude but this, that the Apoſtles were unacquainted with it?

What Ground is left our Opponents, but only to ſay, that Infants might be baptized, tho' the Scripture does not mention it. *A ſorry Shift!* They may as well ſay, that Infants alſo received the Lord's Supper; becauſe the Words are expreſs, that *thoſe who were baptized, continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and in* breaking of Bread, *&c.*

So that upon an Examination of this Place, our Aſſertion, That profeſſing Believers are the only proper Subjects of Baptiſm, ſtill abides impregnable; and the *Abſurdity*, and *Nonſenſe*, which Mr. *F.* would *fling* ſo plentifully on our Arguments, rebound on his own: When he does not repreſent the ſame Promiſe, to be as full to the Children, as it is to the Parents: When he would diſjoin that which the Apoſtle puts together, and indeed invert the Order of his Words, by placing Baptiſm before

fore Repentance, contrary to the whole Tenor of the Word of God: When he would urge that by Children, we muſt underſtand little Infants, who are incapable to receive the Holy Ghoſt by hearing, according to the ſtated Order of God: When he aſſerts that the Apoſtle mentioning the Gentiles, ſpeaks in the future Tenſe, contrary to the very Conſtruction of the Words: And, when he inſinuates that Believers Infants are to be baptized, tho' the whole Context makes utterly againſt him. Hence it plainly appears, that this Place of Scripture has another Meaning than what Mr. *F.* hath aſſign'd to it. 'Tho' he profeſſes he can as ſoon turn Sceptick, and 'conclude that the Scripture has no certain Meaning at 'all, as conclude that the Scripture now under Debate, 'can have a contrary Meaning to what he has aſſign'd' Whether he'll turn Sceptick, I can't tell--But this I am ſure of, that a Miſinterpretation of Scripture, is attended with very dangerous Conſequences, as well as Scepticiſm. And his Certainty and Reſolution in this Caſe, ſhews his firm Attachment to his own Opinion, and Gloſs upon the Text, more than it proves the Meaning he has aſſign'd, to be the real Intent of the Words. Upon the whole, Infants Right to Church-membership, under the New Teſtament Diſpenſation, is ſo far from being proved or confirmed, by this Scripture (of which Mr. *F.* ſays it is enough to their Purpoſe, if there were no other) that it can't be done without manifeſt Violence offered to theſe ſacred Words.

At the Cloſe he entertains his Readers with an Apology for his dwelling ſo long on theſe Words--And for Amends, tells them he purpoſes greater Brevity hereafter; but withal, gives them to underſtand, if they don't find his Performance according to his Purpoſe, they muſt know the Cauſe of it to be the great *Heaps* of *Rubbiſh* caſt on every controverted Text, which requires *Time* and *Pains* to *ſhove* them away. 'Tis reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that every thinking Man, will conſider One whoſe Work is ſo great, and make Allowance of Time in Proportion to do it. But Mr. *F.* muſt have very exalted Thoughts of himſelf and his Brethren, if he ſuppoſes

that they have not brought at leaſt their equal Share of Rubbiſh, to make theſe numerous Heaps to become ſo great. However this Gentleman is pleas'd to call our Arguments by the odious Name of *Rubbiſh*, yet I am ready to think, there are ſuch great Heaps of Scriptural Evidences, which ſtand in his Way of proving Infants to be the Subjects of Baptiſm, that were he to take much more Time and Pains, he would not be able with his Shovel of human Conſequences, ever to *ſhove* them out of his Way.

'I next advance (ſays he) that very clear and unanſwerable Place, in *Rom.* xi. 16, 17. *For if the Firſt Fruit be holy, the Lump is alſo holy: And if the Root be holy, ſo are the Branches: And if ſome of the Branches be broken off, and thou being a wild Olive-Tree, wert graffed in amongſt them, and with them partakeſt of the Root, and Fatneſs of the Olive-Tree.*' The Expreſſions (we find) are metaphorical: Now 'tis certain, no Metaphor is to be *ſtrain'd* to prove any Thing which is not reveal'd elſewhere in Scripture: That the Infants of believing Gentiles are fœderally holy, and the Subjects of Baptiſm, is no where revealed in Scripture: Then to improve the Apoſtle's metaphorical Expreſſions, of *an Olive Tree cutting off--Graffing in, &c.* to prove Infants Right to Baptiſm, appears at firſt Sight very weak and inſufficient.

2. The Gentiles who were graffed in, were not graffed into the *Jewiſh* Church, as it ſtood under the Law; but into the New Teſtament Church, under the Goſpel Diſpenſation; which, as I have ſhown, was conſtituted and made up of profeſſing Believers. And I may add, 1 *Cor.* xii. 13. *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one* Body, *whether we be* Jews *or* Gentiles, *whether we be Bond or Free: And have been all made to drink into one Spirit.* Did the Sacrament of Baptiſm initiate Perſons into the *Jewiſh*, or into the Goſpel Church? Into the Goſpel Church no Doubt: For if otherwiſe, the *Jews* would have no Need to be baptized, to initiate them into the viſible Church, under the New Teſtament, if they were in it already. Mr. *F.* himſelf, I think, fully owns what I am now upon, when he ſays, 'There is a

wide

'wide Difference between *Gathering* and *Forming* a 'Church from among thoſe who are ignorant of Chriſ-'tianity; and a Church already gathered, and form'd, 'and inſtructed---For in proſeliting *Jews* or Pagans to 'Chriſtianity, they muſt of Neceſſity be taught, before 'they can either profeſs their Faith in the Doctrines of it, 'or be admitted to Baptiſm.'

Pray what can Mr. *F.* call this Church thus gathered, by teaching, from amongſt *Jews* and *Pagans*? but the New Teſtament viſible Church. And what are the Materials whereof this Chriſtian Church is form'd and conſtituted? Why thoſe that are taught (whether *Jews* or *Pagans)* and who do profeſs their Faith in the Doctrines of Chriſtianity, and are thereupon admitted to Baptiſm.

One ſhould think by all this, that we are perfectly agreed as to the firſt Conſtitution of the New Teſtament Church. Now I ſay, the Believing Gentiles were graffed into this New Teſtament Church, thus gathered, FORM'D, and inſtructed, and ſo had the Goſpel preach'd unto them, and partook of all its Benefits together with thoſe *Jews*, which through Grace believed; and thus both *Jews* and *Gentiles* in ſweet Goſpel Unity, enjoy'd the Fatneſs of the Olive Tree, and no otherwiſe: But that the Infants of thoſe Believing *Jews* or *Gentiles* were admitted to Baptiſm upon the Account of Covenant Holineſs, is a Notion never as yet confirmed by Scripture, nor ever like to be.

Having prepared the Way ſo far, we need not be much concern'd about all the Force Mr. *F.* raiſes here againſt the Truth we profeſs. He argues from this Text: 'However (ſays he) here is aſſerted, 1. the fœderal Holi-'neſs of Believers Children. If the Root be holy, ſo are 'the Branches: God has ſaid it, and who dare to unſay 'it? The Anabaptiſts are ſtill puzzled about this fœde-'ral Holineſs, and ſome cannot, others perhaps will not 'underſtand it.' *Anſ.* Whatever *Ignorance* and *Obſtinacy* Mr. *F.* imagines the Anabaptiſts to be poſſeſs'd with, I can aſſure him they are not ſo much puzzled to underſtand what Fœderal Holineſs is, as they are to find Scriptural Grounds for it under the Goſpel Diſpenſation. The

Reaſon of their Ignorance, is for want of knowing that which no Body can ſhew them. And the Cauſe of their Obſtinacy, is for not taking the Aſſertions of their Opponents for ſufficient Proof, without Scriptural Teſtimony. But how is the Fœderal Holineſs of Believers Children aſſerted in this Text? 'Why if the Root be holy, ſo are 'the Branches.'---If according to Mr. *F.* we underſtand the Apoſtle to mean *Abraham* by this Metaphor? How can the Fœderal Holineſs of Believers Children be aſſerted here? Mr. *F.* won't aſſert ſure, that every Believing Parent is a Root to his Family or Poſterity, as *Abraham* was to his? or that any ſuch Thing is here intended by the Apoſtle; for the *Jews*, the Poſterity of *Abraham*, were called but the Branches, much leſs then can any *Gentiles* be called the Root; of whom the Apoſtle ſaith they were graffed in among the Branches: But that the natural Offspring of thoſe Branches (the *Gentiles*) who were graffed in contrary to Nature, are upon that Account fœderally Holy, is what the Apoſtle does not aſſert, nor any Thing in his Scope which tends that Way. For the *Jews*, the Natural Branches ſtood, not by Fœderal Holineſs, as under the Law, but by Faith in Chriſt; and ſo in the New Teſtament Church, which as I have proven, was made up of profeſſing Believers:---But their Infant Seed were not baptized as we have an Account of. Now amongſt theſe, the Believing *Gentiles* were graffed in, and partook alſo of the Benefits of the Goſpel, *Rom.* xv. 12. And this is indeed agreeable with the Apoſtle's Words, of the *Gentiles* partaking of the Fatneſs of the Olive Tree. The Sum is juſt this; That Believing *Jews* and *Gentiles* were united together in one Body in the New Teſtament Church, and ſo were Partakers together of the precious and nouriſhing Benefits of the Goſpel of Chriſt. But what Fatneſs is there in External Privileges ſimply conſidered? Nay what Fatneſs is there in Baptiſm to Infants? ſeeing our Opponents are not able to mention any Nouriſhment this Ordinance of God's Houſe affords them, whilſt Infants. To Baptize Infants can't be doing Obedience and Service to God, becauſe he has not commanded it. To Baptize Infants, ſeals no

Promiſe

Promiſe to them, becauſe there is no Promiſe annex'd to Infant Baptiſm. And yet this is the *Mighty Nothing* that muſt be ſo ſtrenuouſly ſupported to divide the Chriſtian World with, as Mr. *F.* further urges: 'If the Children 'of Believing *Gentiles* are excluded, we muſt read the 'Scripture backwards, and ſay, the Believing *Gentiles* did 'not partake of the Root and Fatneſs of the ſame Olive 'Tree with the Believing *Jews*.'---But why this haſte? This Gentleman ſadly forgets himſelf, for he has not yet ſhewn that the Children of the Believing *Jews* were admitted into the New Teſtament Church; what runs in his Mind, is the *Jewiſh* National Church under the Law: But the *Gentiles* were not graffed into that, but into the new gather'd and FORM'D Church, made up of *Jews* proſelyted to Chriſtianity, *i. e.* the Chriſtian viſible Church under the New Teſtament Diſpenſation. And before Mr. *F.* can have any Room to ſay that we muſt read the Scripture backwards, he muſt firſt prove that any *Jewiſh* Infants were admitted into the New Teſtament Church; and till he does that, we will read this Scripture forwards, without any Oppoſition; yea, and People after us to Thouſand Generations.

2*dly*. He ſays, 'The Text aſſerts that the Believing 'Gentiles were made Partakers of the ſame Privileges 'that *Abraham* and his Seed partook of; *Thou being a* '*wild Olive Tree*. Here this one Thing is plain beyond 'Diſpute, *viz.* That the ſame Privileges from which the 'unbelieving *Jews* were broken off, the ſame were the 'Believing Gentiles graffed into.' *Anſ.* The Text does only aſſert, that Believing Gentiles did partake with the Believing *Jews*, of the Root and Fatneſs of the Olive Tree, *i, e.* Spiritual and ſaving Benefits, in Unity in the New Teſtament Church: But does not aſſert that the Gentiles were graffed into the *Jewiſh* Church, as it ſtood under the Law; or that the *Jeweſh* Church State continued under the Goſpel Diſpenſation. Nay the Text does not aſſert that any of the Infant Seed of either *Jews* or Gentiles were entitled to Baptiſm by Birth-Privilege, or fœderal Holineſs. From this Place, under Conſideration, theſe Concluſions may properly be deduc'd, concurrent

with other Places of Holy Scripture. 1. That nothing ſhort of Faith in the *Meſſiah* gave any of the *Jews* Admittance to, and a Standing in the New Teſtament Church; elſe why were the unbelieving *Jews* rejected, notwithſtanding their being the Seed of *Abraham*, &c?

2. That none of the Gentiles were admitted into the New Teſtament Church, but by Faith likewiſe: 'Thou 'ſtandeſt by Faith.'

3. That the New Teſtament Church is made up of profeſſing Believers *only*.

4. That it is the Apoſtle's Scope to ſhew the ſpecial and ſaving Benefits which Believers, *Jews* and *Gentiles*, do enjoy by the Goſpel: To have their Souls nouriſhed by the Fatneſs of the Olive Tree; and alſo to keep the latter humble in their high Enjoyments.

Now upon the Whole, inaſmuch as the Apoſtle does neither aſſert the Fœderal Holineſs of Believers Infants, nor give us any Account of the Natural Offspring of *Gentiles* to be included in the Ingrafture, together with their Believing Parents, we juſtly reject our Opponents Conſequences on this Head, as being altogether *forc'd*, and quite invalid. And the Point to be proven, *viz.* That Infants are Church Members under the New Teſtament Diſpenſation, juſt remains where it was, *viz.* An Aſſertion without Proof, and therefore not worth any one's Notice or Regard. Whilſt in the mean Time, the Truth we profeſs and maintain, That Profeſſing Believers are the only proper Subjects of Baptiſm, like *pure Gold*, ſtill retains its *Weight*, *Worth*, and *Splendor*.

'A Third Scripture I advance (ſays he) for Proof of the 'Point, is 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. *For the unbelieving Huſband is 'ſanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is ſanctified by the Huſband, elſe were your Children unclean, but 'now are they holy.*'

All that Mr. *F.* advances from the Scripture to ſerve his Purpoſe, is eaſily refuted, by obſerving the Occaſion of the Words, and Scope of the Apoſtle in them, which was to reſolve the *Corinthians* in a Caſe of Conſcience, reſpecting Divorcement, *ver.* xii. 13. It ſeems ſome among them held themſelves polluted, by being married

to

to Unbelievers, *i. e.* Heathen Idolaters (whom they had married before their Converſion) and thought therefore of parting from them. The *Jews* of old were ſtrictly forbid to marry with other Nations, *Deut.* vii. 3. 4. *Nehemiah* at the Reformation (on the Return of the *Jews* out of the *Babyloniſh* Captivity, ſeverely puniſhed thoſe who had married ſtrange Wives, *Neh.* xiii. 23. 25. And *Ezra* the Prieſt taught them what was the Will of God in that Caſe. *Ye have tranſgreſſed, and have taken ſtrange Wives to encreaſe the Treſpaſs of* Iſrael. *Now therefore make Confeſſion unto the Lord God of your Fathers, and do his Pleaſure, and* SEPARATE *yourſelves from the People of the Land, and from the* ſtrange Wives. *Ezra* x. 10. 11. 'Tis not improbable that the Scruple of the *Corinthians* aroſe upon the Conſideration of God's former Appointment among the *Jews*, and ſo thought themſelves polluted by *dwelling* with Infidels, and that it was diſpleaſing to God. Their Queſtion ſeem'd to be whether their Marriage was not diſſolved upon one's embracing Chriſtianity, and ſo their Cohabitation unlawful.

The Apoſtle reſolves this Caſe, that their Marriage is not diſſolved, upon One's embracing Chriſtianity, and the other not; *For the unbelieving Huſband is ſanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is ſanctified by the Huſband:* 'The Conjugal Society of the unbelieving 'Party, is ſanctified (*i. e.* ſays ‡ Mr. *Cradock*, made 'lawful and allowed) to the believing Party, 1 *Tim.* iv. '5.' 'I rather think (ſays *Pool* *) it (*i. e.* the Word '*ſanctified*) ſignifies brought into ſuch a State, that the 'Believer, without *Offence* to the Law of God, may 'continue in a Married Eſtate with ſuch a Yoke-Fel-'low; and the State of Marriage is an Holy State, not-'withſtanding the Diſparity with Reference to Re-'ligion.' Elſe were your Children unclean, *i. e.* if the Diverſity in Religion diſſolved your Marriage Covenant, or your Co-habitation, upon that Account, was unlawful, your Children begotten ſince, or in ſuch a State, would be illegitimate, or Baſtards. But it is not ſo, for the Unbeliever is ſanctified by the Believer (made lawful

‡ Apoſt. Hiſt. Page 163. * In Loc.

ful) your Marriage is not diſannulled, or made void; but you are lawful Huſband and Wife, and your Children holy, *i. e.* born in lawful Wedlock, or legitimate Children.

This appears to be the natural, unconſtrain'd, and genuine Senſe of the Place. Here is no Ground to conclude, that the Apoſtle was about aſſerting the Children of Believers to be fœderally Holy, and the Subjects of Baptiſm, even as Mr. *F.* himſelf ſtates the Queſtion, *viz.* 'Whether a Believer might lawfully dwell with an Unbeliever, as Huſband and Wife?' Now had it been unlawful for ſuch to dwell together as Huſband and Wife, what Conſequence could Mr. *F.* poſſibly infer, but that which every one knows, *viz.* That their Children would be unclean, *i. e.* Baſtards? For ſurely nothing could follow an unlawful Cohabitation, but an illegitimate, or unlawful Offspring. But ſeeing it was lawful for ſuch to dwell together as Huſband and Wife, what can any one rationally underſtand on the other Hand, but that the Apoſtle meant their Children were *legitimate?* Our Gloſs appears ſo natural and genuine, from the Apoſtle's Expreſſions, and from the Queſtion, as Mr. *F.* himſelf ſtates it, that it is not readily overthrown. Tho' he is pleaſed to ſay, that the Refutation of our Expoſition, is eaſy. Truly he muſt advance ſomething more than he has yet done (or his bare ſaying, that one of the Parents being a Believer, convey'd to the Children the Priviledge of Church-memberſhip) before he can refute it; ſeeing there is no ſuch Thing (as our Opponents urge) intimated in the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe; nor can rationally be deduc'd from his Words.

For the *Corinthians* to queſtion the Unlawfulneſs of ſuch Cohabitation, plainly beſpeaks, they were unacquainted with any ſuch Thing, as the fœderal Holineſs of Believers Children; which they could not have been ignorant of, if the Apoſtles had conſtantly taught ſuch Doctrine, as our Opponents ſuggeſt.

Neither does our Argument afford thoſe Conſequences, which Mr. *F.* would fain infer from it: For Inſtance; 'That the Children of all Unbelievers are Baſtards.

Baſtards.' Seeing there is no Body queſtions but Marriage is *lawful* and honourable in them--But it was queſtion'd among the *Corinthians*, whether it was *lawful* for a Believer and Unbeliever, to dwell together as Huſband and Wife: The Caſes are not Parallel, therefore his Inference is falſe.

To what Purpoſe does he tell us, that this is the ſame Word, which the Apoſtles uſed in their Epiſtles to the Churches? *Tois agiois*, to the Saints, or Holy: There is no Reaſon to conclude from thoſe Epiſtles, that the Apoſtles ſent them to Infants, together with their Parents. Neither will it hold, becauſe Church Members are called *Agioi*, Holy, that therefore the Holineſs here attributed to Children, proves them to be Church-members; for the Church-members, to whom the Apoſtles wrote, were called holy------Not becauſe they were born of Believing Parents, but becauſe they were called of God, *Rom.* i. 7. 1 *Cor.* i. 2. And the Apoſtles likewiſe ſhew which Way they were called, *viz.* By the preaching of the Goſpel, 2 *Theſ.* ii. 14. Can any Thing then be more vain and abſurd, than for Mr. *F.* to inſinuate, that Believers Infants may be called Holy, in the ſame Senſe that thoſe Church-members were ſo denominated, *viz.* From the inward Work of Grace begun in their Souls, and an outward Profeſſion of, and Conformity to Goſpel Truths in their Lives, when there is no ſuch Thing mentioned concerning theſe Children? Are they ſaid to be *called* of God, Faithful Brethren? Is their Faith ſpoken of throughout the World? Is their Love, Patience and Hope, any where commended? Is their Goſpel Obedience manifeſt? Not at all. Hence it is ſafe to conclude, that thoſe Children are not called holy in the Senſe that Church-members are ſo denominated; but truly and properly in the Way I have before obſerved, however contrary it may be to Mr. *F*'s received Opinion. And how impertinent is Mr. F's Queſtion! 'I would aſk, why the Anabaptiſts may not as well underſtand the Apoſtle to write to thoſe in *Rome*, *Corinth*, or *Galatia*, who were not Baſtards, as to underſtand holy in this Text, to be only legitimate?' *Anſ.* It

ſeems

ſeems by Mr. *F.* that if we underſtand the Word to be legitimate in this Place, we muſt neceſſarily underſtand the Apoſtle to write to thoſe at *Rome*, &c. who were not Baſtards. But I think I have ſhewn a very great Difference in the Caſe. As there is nothing that moves us to think the Apoſtle meant Legitimacy, when he wrote to the *Saints* at *Rome*; ſo neither is there any Thing here, that inclines us to believe he meant *Fœderal Holineſs*, when he reſolved the *Corinthian* Doubts.

But being weary of ſtanding to Anſwer trivial Objections, I proceed to his Fourth, and laſt Scripture, advanc'd to prove Infants Church-memberſhip: Namely, *Mark* x. 13, 14. *And they brought young Children to him, that he ſhould* touch *them*' (not baptize them) *and his Diſciples rebuked thoſe that brought them: But when* Jeſus *ſaw it, he was much diſpleaſed, and ſaid unto them, Suffer the little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not: For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* v. 16. *And he took them up in his Arms, put his Hands upon them, and bleſſed them.* It ſeems wherever our Opponents find any Thing ſpoken of Children, they preſently fancy their Baptiſm is not very far off, however foreign to their Purpoſe it be. Mr. *F.* having fail'd of producing any Thing like a Proof, hitherto, for Infants Church-memberſhip, or their Right to Baptiſm, hopes to find ſome Relief from this Place now under Conſideration; from which he obſerves divers Particulars, but ſeems to be at a great Loſs upon which of them to fix, as a certain Ground of his Practice. One while he tells us, 'The 'Diſciples forbad the Children to be brought to Chriſt, 'as the Anabaptiſts now do.'--Intimating, that thoſe Children were brought to Chriſt with a Deſign to have them baptized. But a little after ſays, 'The Anabap-'tiſts cannot prove that thoſe Children were not baptized 'before by *John* the Baptiſt; which ſeems the more 'probable, in that Chriſt laid his Hands on them, 'which was an *extraordinary Ordinance then in uſe, and* 'always adminiſtred after Baptiſm.' If theſe Children were baptized before by *John* (as Mr. *F.* thinks it to be the *more probable* Opinion) certainly then they were not brought

brought to Chriſt with any View to have them baptized, unleſs their Parents (or whoever brought them) were for having their Children *twice* baptized; which is not very likely. If the Diſciples forbad them to come to Chriſt, for *Impoſition of Hands*, the Baptiſts can't at all be charg'd with forbidding Children to come to Chriſt; for our Opponents don't plead that they have a Right to that *Extraordinary Ordinance*. 'Tis ſome odd kind of Talk to ſay that we forbid thoſe to come, which nobody offers to bring. Here is ſome mighty Reſemblance ſure, betwixt the Diſciples and Anabaptiſts! when the Caſes you ſee, are no Ways parallel. At this Rate of arguing, it may be as juſtly ſaid 'The Diſciples then forbad 'Children to be brought to Chriſt, as the Preſbyterians 'now do'---In not admitting them to Impoſition of Hands, or to the Lord's Supper; when, in the mean Time, Nobody offers to bring them.

But if his Meaning is, that the Baptiſts forbid Children to be baptized, as he ſuppoſes the Diſciples forbad them to come to that Extraordinary Ordinance.---He ſhould have expreſs'd himſelf ſo, and not have labour'd to inſinuate into the Minds of his Readers, That the Diſciples were rebuk'd for that Fault, which he would fain Charge upon the Baptiſts, *viz.* Forbidding Children to be brought to Baptiſm, when no ſuch Thing is mentioned in the Text, nor urged from it by our Opponent.

But then it ſeems here is a new modelled Argument, which Mr. *F.* would frame from thoſe Words, *viz.* 'Chriſt laid his Hand upon them Children as baptized Per-'ſons, therefore Children are to be baptized.' *Anſ.* It does not ſeem a very *difficult Taſk*, to prove that thoſe Infants were not baptized by *John* (if we muſt be ſtill ſet upon to prove a Negative) not only from what Mr. *F.* ſays, 'The 'Scriptures which require Faith and Repentance, are 'addreſſed only to grown Perſons, and not to Infants' and we find *John* baptized none upon any other Account; but even from the *Carriage* and *Behaviour* of the Diſciples on this Occaſion: For had it been the known Cuſtom of *John* to baptize Infants, and the conſtant Practice of Chriſt to *lay his Hands* upon them as baptized Perſons.

It

It is no ways reaſonable to imagine that the Diſciples would have entertain'd ſuch *wrong Notions about* THESE *Children's Privileges, more than others* (unleſs theſe were the Children of unbelieving Parents, that they would not have brought to Chriſt) ſo as to forbid them that brought them with ſuch a good Deſign: No, the very Conduct of the Diſciples on this Occaſion, evidently beſpeaks there was no ſuch Thing practiſed by Chriſt, either to order Infants to be baptized, or to lay his Hands upon them as baptized Perſons; and let our Opponents ſhew the Contrary at their Leiſure.

Biſhop *Taylor* * in his Repreſentation of the Baptiſts Argument, hath theſe Words, 'From the Action of 'Chriſt's Bleſſing Infants, to infer that they are to be 'baptized, proves nothing ſo much as that there is great 'Want of better Arguments; the Concluſion would be 'with more Probability derived thus: Chriſt bleſſed 'Children, and ſo diſmiſſed them, but baptized them 'not, therefore Infants are not to be baptized.'

By the Way, I ſhall juſt obſerve, that tho' Mr. *F.* calls Impoſition of Hands (which was always adminiſtred after Baptiſm) an Extraordinary Ordinance then in Uſe (or perhaps more properly an Ordinance then uſed in extraordinary Times) Yet I am perſuaded he will not quickly ſhew that it is now aboliſhed; when, beſides the Place he cites, *viz. Acts* xix. 5, 6, he conſults *Acts* viii. 14---17. and *Heb.* 6. 2. where we find it was adminiſtred to baptized Believers as ſuch, and to be one of the Six Foundation Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt; which Account does not well ſuit with laying on of Hands upon Officers in the Church: For as the whole Goſpel was confirm'd by Signs and Wonders, and divers Miracles, and Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt in general, ſo was every Ordinance confirm'd in particular, and amongſt the reſt, this of Impoſition of Hands upon baptized Believers, was alſo ratified and confirmed by the extraordinary Out-pouring of the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt which accompanied it, *Acts* xix. 6. Beſides the Thing ſignified thereby, *viz.* the Gift of the Holy Ghoſt, in his ſanctifying, comforting, and ſealing Operations and Influences, is the perpetual Privilege

* Liberty of Pro. Page 310.

Privilege of all Believers in common, throughout all Ages, *John* vii. 37. Hence we have no Ground to conclude this New Teſtament Ordinance, thus confirm'd, *&c.* to be yet aboliſhed ; but is *now* to be *always adminiſtred* after Baptiſm, as it was in *Apoſtolic Times.* And for a *Lamentation* it may be ſaid, that our Opponents have loſt the Order and Beauty of the Goſpel Church. This Ordinance of laying on of Hands upon baptized Believers, is quite loſt amongſt them. And Baptiſm for the moſt Part is gone to the very Name.

Now ſeeing Infants Right to Baptiſm is not found in this Text, and our Opponents don't bring their Infants to have Hands laid upon them, if ſuch a Thing was intended here, conſequently their Noiſe and Clamour about our denying Baptiſm to Infants, diſappears like a Bubble on the Water, or Smoke in the Air.

'The Anabaptiſts argue (ſays he) that theſe Infants 'were only propos'd as Emblems of Humility, Meekneſs, '*&c.*' If they did ſo, they would not differ much from ſome learned Pædo-baptiſts in this Point. I have perus'd divers Baptiſts Authors upon the Place, and I don't find them arguing in ſuch Manner. But whether this Allegation be taken out of his * *common Storehouſe* Mr. *Sydenham*, or out of Mr. *Flavel*, or this be a Fiction of his own, I am not concern'd, nor ſhall I at this Time take any further Notice of it, and all his Reaſoning upon it; but only cite the Judgment of ſome *Pædobaptiſts* upon the Occaſion. † The *Aſſembly of Divines* ſay on Verſe 13. '*The* '*Diſciples rebuked them* (not the Children but thoſe that 'brought them, *Mark* 10. 13. They thought it a Thing 'troubleſome to Chriſt and unfit for him to meddle with 'Children who could not be taught, for want of Under-'ſtanding, and needed no Healing by his Miracles. *ver.* '14. *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven)* Ye have no Rea-'ſon to blame them for bringing Children to me, for 'they *may* be ſuch as have Intereſt to the Kingdom of 'Heaven, as well as others of riper Years ; and UNLESS 'YE BE LIKE THEM, ye ſhall never come there.'

Cartwright

* Vide his Preface, Page 7. † Annotations on Matt. 19. Printed Anno 1645.

‡ *Cartwright* hath theſe Words: 'And as touching 'this Bleſſing of Children and Impoſition of Hands upon 'them, it is peculiar unto our Saviour Chriſt; uſed nei-'ther by his Diſciples nor by his Apoſtles, either before 'or after his Aſcenſion: Whereunto maketh, that the 'Children being brought, that he ſhould pray over them; 'he did not pray for them, but bleſſed them, that is to 'ſay, commanded them to be bleſſed, thereby to ſhew 'his Divine Power. Theſe being alſo yet Infants;--- 'being alſo in all Likelihood *unbaptized.*' According to him then, Chriſt did not lay his Hands upon them as baptized Perſons.

'Upon the whole (ſays Mr. *F.*) we may ſafely under-'ſtand the Words, as if our Lord had ſaid, The In-'fants of ſuch Parents as believe in me, ſuch Infants, I 'ſay are to be brought to me, and treated as Members of 'the Viſible Church; *for of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven.*' *Anſ.* There are theſe Difficulties in the Way, to under-ſtand theſe Words thus with Safety. 1. Chriſt did not ſay, ſuffer the little Children of believing Parents to come to me; but indefinitely, *Suffer the little Children to come to me*; after all, Mr. *F.* never can ſhew that Chriſt the Savi-our, acts with that Partiality, and narrowneſs of Spirit as he is pleaſed to write; even to admit the Infants of Church-Members, and to reject thoſe of Non-Members.

2. Becauſe Chriſt gave no Orders to baptize them, nor inform'd us that they were Subjects of any Goſpel Ordi-nance: And for any to adminiſter Baptiſm to them, is nothing leſs than to be wiſe above what is written. 'Tis alſo a bold Encroachment upon Chriſt's Kingly Preroga-tive, to enjoin the Baptizing of Infants, which the Lord Jeſus has no where commanded.

The Expreſſions of our Opponents on another Occaſi-on, are pertinent here. † 'The making of new reli-'gious Laws, ſeems to us to be an *Invaſion* upon the 'Kingly Office of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to whoſe Roy-'alty it peculiarly belongs to give Laws to his Church. 'Hence the Apoſtle *James* informs us, that *there is one* '*Law-giver* (*i. e.* one only, who is excluſive of all 'others,

‡ On Matt. 19. Pag. 96. † Apology of Brunſwick Preſbytery. Pag. 54.

'others) *who is able to ſave and deſtroy*: Subjoining, '*who art thou then that judgeſt another*, James iv. 12. '*Col.* i. 18. Chriſt is the *Head of the Body, the Church*, 'he is conſtituted the King of *Zion*. Now if the 'Church of Chriſt has but one Head, one King, one 'Law-giver, how can any Men on Earth make Laws 'in Addition to Chriſt's, for the Government of his 'Subjects in religious Matters, without making the 'Church a monſtrous Body, with many Heads? 'Without commencing Kings in his Kingdom, or ra-'ther ſetting up a Kingdom of their own, in Oppoſition 'to his? If making new religious Laws, as to their 'Matter, or adding new Penalties to old ones, be not 'Acts of kingly Power, we deſire to know what is?'

We are not afraid to aſſert publickly, that no Law given by Chriſt, for baptizing Infants, can be found any where regiſtred in the Rolls of divine Laws: Therefore it muſt be done without Law, or elſe by a Law of Mens making; which is attended with all the dreadful Conſequences of ſuch a Practice, as expreſs'd in the cited Paragraph---There is therefore, very good Reaſon why we can't ſafely underſtand the Words, according to Mr. *F*'s Comment upon them: But we may very ſafely conclude, that there is not any Thing in thoſe Words, which oppoſes the ſtated Order, and revealed Will of Chriſt in the Goſpel, *viz.* 'That Profeſſing Believers are the 'proper Subjects of Baptiſm.'

'I have methinks, proven from this Text, the Con-'firmation of Children's Church membership, from 'which it will eaſily follow, that Baptiſm is their Right; 'or elſe let the Anabaptiſts prove, that there are ſome 'Church members who ought not to be baptized; but 'this they cannot.' Mr. *F.* muſt excuſe me, if I ſhould happen to miſtake his Meaning any where, for at Times he ſeems to forget himſelf what he is about; an Inſtance of it we have in this odd Piece of Buſineſs now before us, which he has put us upon, *viz.* to prove that there are ſome Church-members who ought not to be baptized. One while he is in the Humour to tell us, § 'That Baptiſm

'is

§ Page 61.

'is an initiating Ordinance, whereby Perſons are receiv-
'ved into the Church:' And to call the Church the School of Chriſt, and that Baptiſm is the Door of Entrance into that School, and that Infants are capable of being entred into it by that Door. But it ſeems there is beſides that, another Door of Entrance into the Church, *viz.* by natural Generation, or as Mr. *Durham* ‖ chuſes to expreſs it, *by Birth-right*. So that a viſible Chriſtian begets a viſible Chriſtian, for ſo I ſuppoſe they account all Church-members to be.

Such Notions and pretty Fancies, may indeed paſs with thoſe, who are wedded to their fond Opinions; but will be deemed mere Abſurdities and Fooleries, when compared with the Account the Scriptures give us, of the New-Teſtament Churches, and their Members.

Mr. *F.* may know, that I am not concern'd at all to Reſolve him in this Point, 'till he firſt makes appear, that Perſons are viſible Church-members before they are baptized.

We are upon this directly informed, how unbaptized Members of the viſible Church may be excommunicated, *viz.* 'If we deny ſuch Infants a Right to the initiating 'Seal of the Covenant, we thereby caſt them out of the 'Church.'--Probably he means if Baptiſm is deny'd them, they are thereby caſt the Out-ſide of the Pale of the Church ---For after Baptiſm it ſeems, they are only within the Pale of the Church, as they call it, till they grow up to Years of Diſcretion--But if all they pretend to baptize are Church-Members, their Scheme juſt ſerves to fill the New-Teſtament Church with Unbelievers, and to build it up of unprepared Materials. The true Reaſon why the Baptiſts don't baptize their Infants, is not for want of Love and Affection to their Offspring, but for want of a poſitive Precept, or Scripture Example, to countenance ſuch a Practice. 'Tis not therefore without Cauſe, that they withſtand the unwarranted Practice of their Opponents.

'Now (ſays he) tho' the Name of Baptiſm is not 'found in theſe Texts, yet we find what may be as ſa-'tisfying and convincing to unbyaſſed Minds, that are 'even

‖ On the Revelations. Page 489.

'even moderately judicious.' *Reply.* If Mr. *F.* means by an unbyaſſed Mind, a Perſon that ſtands inclin'd to neither Side, 'tis very ſtrange he ſhould aſſert there is Matter of equal Satisfaction and Conviction to unbyaſs'd Minds, to be found in theſe Texts, that Infants are to be baptized, as if it had been expreſs'd in the Words. I am apt to believe it would be more *convincing* to unbyaſs'd Minds, and more *ſatisfying* to byaſs'd Minds too, if there was a Command or Example to be found for Infant-baptiſm, in theſe, or any other Texts in the Bible, than now it is: But Mr. *F.* tells us, "For my Part, I cannot wiſh for clearer Evidence to convince me that Believers Infants have a Right to Baptiſm, than the Scriptures quoted do afford." *Reply.* 'Tis not poſſible for me to enter into the Secrets of his Mind, to obſerve the unſeen Workings of his Wiſhes, and Satisfaction in the Point; yet in the mean Time, I muſt enjoy my own Way of Thinking in the Caſe. But to the Matter in Hand. We have trac'd this Buſineſs ſo far, and could not find any Thing like a Pillar to ſupport it; but here at length, we happen'd juſt to meet with one great Supporter of that otherwiſe tottering Cauſe, of Infant-baptiſm. We had for ſome Time ago, a ſtrong Suſpicion from current Reports, that the Buſineſs was carried on after ſome ſuch Manner: But ſince our Opponents have publiſh'd it in Print, we have got the Certainty of it; and 'tis to be hop'd they will not attempt to deny their own Prints. The Invention is this: The Miniſter declares he is ſatisfied that Infants have a Right to Baptiſm, then if any amongſt them happens to doubt of the Validity of his Infant-baptiſm, becauſe he can't find a *divine Inſtitution** for it; the Buſineſs is carried on ſomething after this Manner; The Miniſter declares, that he is ſatisfied that Infants have a Right to Baptiſm; and do you pretend to know better than he? Do you think he is in the wrong? Do you ſuppoſe him to be *unbaptiz'd?* Can you imagine he is not in *Covenant with God?* No Miniſter? Not ſo much as a viſible Chriſtian? Nor a Member of the viſible Church, *&c.* All this ſerves to ſurprize

* Divine Right of Infant-baptiſm. Page 4, 11.

and perplex the poor Enquirer! but yet affords no Scriptural Ground to quiet his Conſcience; and if he is not ſtunn'd with theſe maſterly Strokes, why the Miniſter or another, has a whole Heap of Blocks to caſt in his Way; ſuch as theſe, † As to yourſelf, it greatly concerns you to conſider what you are about; if you reject your Baptiſm as a Nullity, you reject all the publick Ordinances of the Goſpel you have been priviledg'd with. Are you going to caſt Contempt upon the Head of the Church, that he has for ſo long Time wholly deſerted all the Churches upon Earth? If Infant-baptiſm is not right, he has left them without a Miniſtry, without Ordinances, and without the inſtituted Means of Salvation. It concerns you ſeriouſly to conſider how uncharitably you offend againſt all the Generation of God's Children, to repreſent the whole Church for ſo many Hundreds of Years, and very much the greateſt Part of it at preſent to be in a State of Heatheniſm, without any Hopes of Salvation, but from the uncovenanted Mercies of God.---It concerns you to conſider what Indignity you offer the bleſſed Spirit--and how you may expect that God will reſent your Renunciation of your Covenant Relation to him, *&c.* Theſe, with Mens profeſſing they could burn at a Stake for Infant-baptiſm, and ſuch like, are great ſwelling Words of Vanity, and juſt ſerve as a *Specimen*, to let the World know in what Manner that Scriptureleſs Practice is ſupported. For by ſuch Ways they keep the Crouds in awe, and terrify thoſe amongſt them, who at any Time queſtion the *Validity* of their Infant-baptiſm---Seeing they have no Scripture to prove it, they labour by theſe *artful Inſinuations*, and *deteſtable Methods*, to keep them in perpetual Fetters of *human Invention*, put upon them *whilſt* Infants, from giving due Obedience to the Lord Jeſus, according to his *Appointment* in the Goſpel. An Inſtance of this we have in the *Dialogue* now before me. How many Perſons have there been from Time to Time, who were enlightened to ſee the Truth and Order of the Goſpel, yet are kept back from ſubmitting to it, becauſe their Miniſters tell them they *muſt*

expect

† Divine Right of Infant-baptiſm, Pages 5, 6, 7.---

expect that God will highly reſent their Renouncing their Infant-baptiſm, &c. as if it was a *Sin* to *reform*, and ſhake off *erroneous* Principles and Practices. Are not theſe the very Methods the *Papiſts* have uſed (with their Noiſe about *Antiquity*, *Succeſſion*, *Infallibility*, *Univerſality*, &c.) to keep the numerous Ignorants attach'd to their Intereſt? And where did that anonymous Gentleman furniſh himſelf with Artillery for the Field, but out of *Rome's Magazine? Arguments* which ſtrike at the very *Principles* of Reformation! and which Proteſtants have long ſince refuted and trodden down like Mire of the Streets, when advanc'd by *Papiſts* in Defence of their ſuperſtitious Traditions. But we muſt ſee them revived, new-dreſs'd, and marſhall'd again, by Proteſtants againſt an Ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt, in Defence of an human Invention (Infant baptiſm) ſet up on the Ruins of Chriſt's ſacred Inſtitution. And what is it to the Buſineſs in Hand, to tell us of the Practice of the Church for ſo many Ages paſt, when the *Man of Sin*, was either aſcending to, or ſitting in the *Temple* of God, and either changed or corrupted the ‡ Doctrines and Ordinances of God's Houſe; when in the mean Time, the Number of God's People were very few, expreſs'd by two Witneſſes; The true Church feeble and obſcure, compared to a Woman fled into the Wilderneſs: Whilſt *Myſtery Babylon*, in Pomp and Grandeur, called herſelf the true Church! And of as little Weight is that Anthor's Reaſonings about Chriſt's Promiſes, to prove Infant-baptiſm. Does he think Chriſt could not make good his Promiſes, without being neceſſitated to countenance an Abuſe and Corruption of his holy Inſtitution, as the Baptizing of Infants manifeſtly is; becauſe there is not the *leaſt* Hint of it in Scripture? In a Word, Let that nameleſs Author, or any other, prove if he can, That Rejecting Infant-baptiſm (which the Scripture no where voucheth) is attended with all theſe frightful Conſequences. Truly his *Neighbour* was in the Right of it, to queſtion the Validity of *that*, for which he could find

‡ Vid. Dr. Goodwin's Diſcourſe of the Glory of the Goſpel. Vol. 5. Page 28. Dan. vii. 25. 2 Theſ. ii. 3, 4. Rev. xiii. 3.

no *divine Inſtitution*; but poor Man, he acted weakly in taking Satisfaction from his Miniſter, without *his* ſhewing him a *divine Warrant* for Infant-baptiſm, to quiet his Conſcience. If he is yet living, I would adviſe him, to ſearch the Scriptures, and ſee for himſelf, and act accordingly.

Mr. *F.* further ſays, 'However clear the Point be 'proven, our Opponents are bent upon it, not to ſuffer 'little Children to be brought to Chriſt, but to forbid 'them.' *Anſ.* We have followed him all along from Text to Text, and here we do profeſſedly declare, the Point is not proven at all, nor any Thing like it--And this here is much of the ſame Nature with what we had laſt under Conſideration, and ſerves much to the ſame Ends, *viz.* to fix their Admirers in their falſe Opinions, and to repreſent the *Baptiſts* as a cruel, heady, ſelf-willed Sort of People; becauſe they won't take their Opponents Conſequences (which are only a Heap of *Non-Sequiturs)* inſtead of Scripture Teſtimonies, for Proof in the Caſe---The Truth is, the Baptiſts (I hope) are *bent* to ſtand by the Rule of the Goſpel, which requires Fruits of Repentance, and a Profeſſion of Faith, in order to Baptiſm; which Infants are incapable of. This opens the Door for me to enter directly on the Conſideration of Mr. *F*'s 4th Aſſertion, *viz.*

'That Infants are capable Subjects of Baptiſm.'

Which he labours to evince--from the Deſign and Signification of Baptiſm, *viz.*

1. The ſolemn Dedication of the baptized Perſons to God.---

2. The Water uſed in Baptiſm, repreſents the Blood of Chriſt---And alſo the gracious Influences of the Holy Ghoſt---Upon the Peruſal of what he ſays on this Head, I don't find any Thing that promiſes much Service to his Cauſe, or like to be very advantageous to his preſent Purpoſe----For ſuppoſing Infants were capable Subjects of Baptiſm, yet if a Capacity to receive an Ordinance was ſufficient to entitle Perſons to the Reception of it, it would follow, that all the Male-Infants of the Heathen Nations had as good a Right to be circumciſed, as the Seed

of

of *Abraham* had; for one was as capable to be the Subject of Circumciſion as the other---If Mr. *F.* ſays they had not, becauſe there was no Command of God for it; ſo ſay we there is none for the baptizing any Infants.

2. Let us turn up the other Side of his Argument here, and ſee how it looks; why, it appears juſt thus,—Are the Infants of *Non-members*, yea of wicked Perſons, *uncapable* to be dedicated to God? Or would it be any more a Sin to devote them to God than the Children of Church-members? Again, Are ſuch Infants incapable of being juſtified and ſaved by the Blood of Chriſt, and ſanctified by his Spirit? Or are they Sinners of that Sort, that puts them quite out of Capacity of Juſtification and Salvation by his Blood, and Sanctification by his Spirit? This can't be ſaid. Well, are they capable of every great Thing ſignified by Baptiſm, and yet not capable of Baptiſm itſelf? Nay, what Sort of Divinity is it, for them to ſay they are capable of the Thing ſignified, but not of the Sign; capable of the Greater, but altogether incapable of the Leſſer? How abſurd, irrational, and defenceleſs is their Poſition! My Opponents are brought unavoidably to this, either to yield unto their own Argument, or elſe aſſert, that all Infants of Non-members, who die in Infancy, are either damn'd or annihilated.' Mr. *F.* may here ſee the Shape of his Argument on both Sides, that it is an Inſtrument which cuts himſelf more, by odds, than his Opponents againſt whom it was deſign'd. Now if the Infants of Non-members are capable of thoſe Spiritual Bleſſings (as none can prove to the Contrary) Mr. *F.* according to his Principles is criminally guilty, in not baptizing them. For there is as much Authority to baptiſe the Infants of Non-members, as thoſe of Church-members---To do one or the other is Scriptureleſs---And one may be done as well as the other, according to this Argument. But if it be ſaid, they are out of Covenant, *&c.* I *Anſ.* The Benefits of the Covenant of Grace are not tied to any fleſhly Line. Beſides this Objection does not help at all in this Point; for the Argument is taken from the Capacity of Children.--- And I do hereby *call upon* him to make appear, that one Infant

is more capable of being juſtified by the Blood of Chriſt, and ſanctified by his Spirit than another? To this I require a direct Anſwer, and not to be put off with ſhifting the Queſtion; or elſe an ingenuous Acknowledgment, that no Argument can be form'd from the Capacity of ſome Infants, more than others in this Caſe, to prove their Right to Baptiſm.

It muſt alſo be obſerv'd, that there is not ſuch a *full Agreement* betwixt our Opponents and us, about the Deſign and Signification of Baptiſm, as Mr. *F.* inſinuates: For we differ in the Senſe and Explanation of the firſt Particular, *viz.* That Baptiſm ſignifies the ſolemn Dedication of the baptized Perſons to God. We ſay, that Perſons can dedicate none to the Lord by Baptiſm, but themſelves; which is confirm'd by all thoſe Places of Scripture, which ſpeak of the Ordinance. Baptiſm being a Goſpel Duty, it neceſſarily requires Faith in the Subject, *Heb.* xi. 6. *Mark* xvi. 16. Or elſe let our Opponents ſhew that there are ſome Goſpel Duties which may be perform'd acceptably to God without Faith; which they cannot; therefore Faith is neceſſarily required in the Party baptized himſelf, as well as in every other Part of Goſpel Worſhip---Infants being incapable to act Faith in the adorable Trinity, at their Baptiſm, or to anſwer a good Conſcience, by ſubmitting to God therein, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. 1 *Pet.* iii. 21. Hence it follows, that Parents (or others) can't bring their Infants to be baptized, under Pretence of dedicating them to God (when he has neither commanded them, nor promiſed them Acceptance in ſo doing) without being guilty of a very great Sin forbidden in the ſecond Commandment, even as our Opponents themſelves explain it, †*viz.* 'That uſing, and any Ways approving any religious 'Worſhip, not inſtituted by God himſelf' is there forbidden, *let the Pretence be what it will.* Juſt ſuch is the baptizing of Infants: It is as clear as the Sun in its Meridian Brightneſs, That Infant-baptiſm is no Inſtitution of God, and therefore cannot be continued in, without daily breaking the ſecond Commandment. Beſides, what adds further to the Sinfulneſs of that Practice,

† See the Aſſembly's Larger Catechiſm.

is,

is, that it is a wretched Abuſe of a ſacred Goſpel Ordinance, by adminiſtring it to *Subjects* not appointed by Chriſt in his Word, under the Pretence of dedicating their Children to God.

2d Particular, which Mr. *F.* mentions, 'That the 'the Water in Baptiſm repreſents the Blood of Chriſt.'--- This is not ſo ſoon proved as aſſerted. Upon this Occaſion, I ſhall cite the Opinion of the judicious and learn'd Mr. *Mede*, on *Tit.* 3. 5. quoted by Mr. *Hutchinſon*: § 'In every Sacrament, as ye well know, there is the out-'ward Symbol or Sign, *Res terrena*, and the *Signatum*, 'figured and repreſented thereby, *Res Cæleſtis*. In this 'of Baptiſm, the Sign, or *Res Terrena*, is waſhing with 'Water: The Queſtion is, what is the *Signatum*, the 'Inviſible and Celeſtial Thing which anſwers there-'unto? In our Catechetical Explications of this My-'ſtery, it is wont to be affirmed, to be the Blood of 'Chriſt; that as Water waſheth away the Filth of the 'Body, ſo the Blood of Chriſt cleanſeth us from the 'Guilt and Pollution of Sin: And there is no Queſtion 'but the Blood of Chriſt is the Fountain of all the Grace 'and Good communicated to us, either in this, or any 'other Sacrament, or Myſtery of the Goſpel. But that 'this ſhould be the *Antiſtoichon*, the Counter-part, or 'Thing figured by the *Water in Baptiſm*, I believe not; 'becauſe the Scripture, which muſt be our Guide and 'Direction in this Caſe, makes it another Thing, to 'wit, the Spirit or Holy Ghoſt; this to be that, whereby 'the Soul is cleanſed and renewed within, as the Body 'with Water is without.---Nor did the Fathers, or 'antient Church, as far as I can find, ſuppoſe any other 'Correlative to the Element in Baptiſm but this (the 'Spirit or Holy Ghoſt) of this they ſpeak often; of the 'Blood of Chriſt they are altogether ſilent, in their Ex-'plications of this Myſtery; many are the Alluſions they 'ſeek out for the Illuſtration thereof, and ſome perhaps 'forced; but this of the Water, ſignifying or having 'any Relation to the Blood of Chriſt, never comes 'amongſt them, which were impoſſible, if they had not

§ Treatiſe concerning the Covenant of Baptiſm, Page 84, &c

' ſuppoſed ſome other Thing figured by the Water than
' it, which barred them from falling on that Conceit.
' The like Silence is to be obſerved in our Liturgy, where
' the Holy Ghoſt is more than once parallel with the
' Water in Baptiſm, Waſhing and Regeneration attri-
' buted thereunto ; but no ſuch Notion of the Blood of
' Chriſt ; and that the *Opinion* thereof is *Novel*, may be
' gathered, becauſe ſome *Lutheran* Divines make it pe-
' culiar and proper to the *Followers* of *Calvin*.

' Whatſoever it be, it hath *no Foundation* in Scripture ;
' and we muſt not of our own Heads aſſign Significations
' to Sacramental Types without ſome Warrant thence :
' For whereas, ſome conceive thoſe two Expreſſions of
' *Rantiſmos*, or Sprinkling, of the Blood of Chriſt, and of
' our being waſhed from our Sins in (or by) his Blood,
' do intimate ſome ſuch Matter, they are ſurely miſta-
' ken ; for thoſe Expreſſions have Reference not to the
' Water of Baptiſm in the New Teſtament, but to the
' Rite and Manner of Sacrificing in the Old, where the
' Altar was wont to be ſprinkled with the Blood of the
' Sacrifices which were offered, and that which was un-
' clean, purified with the ſame Blood : Whence is that
' elegant Diſcourſe of St. *Paul* (*Heb.* 9.) comparing the
' Sacrifice of the Law with that of Chriſt upon the Croſs,
' as much the better. And that whereas in the Law,
' *almoſt all Things are purified with Blood*, ſo much more
' the Blood of Chriſt, who offered himſelf without Spot to
' God, cleanſeth our Conſciences from dead Works ;
' but that this Waſhing, that is, Cleanſing by the Blood
' of Chriſt, ſhould have Reference to Baptiſm, where is
' that to be found ? I ſuppoſe they will not alledge the
' Water and Blood which came out of our Saviour's
' Side, when they pierced him ; for that is taken to ſig-
' nify the two Sacraments ordained by Chriſt ; that of
' Blood, the Euchariſt, of Water, Baptiſm. I add (be-
' cauſe perhaps ſome Men's Fancies are corrupted there-
' with) that there was no ſuch Thing as Sprinkling, or
' *Rantiſmos* uſed in Baptiſm in the Apoſtles Time, nor
' many Ages after them ; and that therefore it is no Way
' probable, *that Sprinkling the Blood of Chriſt*, in *Peter*,
' ſhould have any Reference to the Laver of Baptiſm.

' Let

'Let this then be our Concluſion, that the Blood of 'Chriſt concurs in the Myſtery of Baptiſm, by Way of 'Efficacy and Merit; but not as the Thing there figu-'red, which the Scripture tells us not to be the Blood of 'Chriſt, but the Spirit.'

According to this learned Author, the Opinion that the Water in Baptiſm ſignifies or repreſents the Blood of Chriſt, is *Novel*, and has no Foundation in Scripture.

And that it is not *lawful* to aſſign Significations to Sacramental Types (of our own Heads) without Warrant from the Scriptures, *&c.*

In Reſpect of the third Thing, which Mr. *F.* ſays is repreſented by the Water in Baptiſm, *viz.* 'The gracious 'Influences of the Holy Ghoſt, whereby the Soul is 'ſanctified.' 'Tis obſervable, that we find no Account of any baptized in the Apoſtles Times, but thoſe who were wrought upon by the Influences of the Spirit, or at leaſt profeſſed to aſſent to the Doctrines of the Goſpel, ſee *Rom.* vi. 3, 4, 5. Infants being incapable either to receive the Spirit by the ſtated Miniſtry of the Goſpel, or to profeſs their Aſſent to the Doctrines of it: 'Tis manifeſt they were not intended to be the Subjects of this Ordinance.---Let our Opponents form as many Cavils as they pleaſe, the Truth is, when they adminſter Baptiſm to Infants, after all they have ſaid, they do juſt ſet a Seal to a Blank: For as Biſhop *Taylor* * repreſents it, 'This 'Way of Miniſtration makes Baptiſm to be wholly an 'outward Duty, a Work of the Law, a carnal Ordi-'nance, it makes us adhere to the Letter without Regard 'of the Spirit, to be ſatisfied with Shadows, to return 'to Bondage, to relinquiſh the Myſteriouſneſs, the Sub-'ſtance and Spirituality of the Goſpel.' Again: ‡ And 'therefore, whoever will pertinaciouſly perſiſt in this 'Opinion of the *Pædo-baptiſts*, and practiſe it accord-'ingly, they pollute the Blood of the everlaſting Teſta-'ment, they diſhonour and make a Pageantry of the Sa-'crament, they ineffectually repreſent a Sepulture into 'the Death of Chriſt, and pleaſe themſelves in a Sign 'without Effect, making Baptiſm like the Fig Tree in 'the Goſpel, full of Leaves, but no Fruit; and they in-vocate

* Lib. of Prophecy, Page 327. ‡ Ib. Page 390.

' vocate the Holy Ghoſt in vain, doing as if one ſhould ' call upon him to illuminate a Stone or a Tree.

But it ſeems our Opponents are ſo cloſely attach'd to the *Jewiſh* antiquated Law of Circumciſion, that they can in no wiſe ſee the Rule and Order of the Goſpel in the Caſe of Baptiſm, tho' it ſhines with more than Oriental Brightneſs throughout the whole New Teſtament, that he that runs, may read who are the proper Subjects of this Holy Ordinance; yet they are ſtill inclin'd to think when Circumciſion was inſtituted, Infant Baptiſm was alſo ſome how included in that Inſtitution, as that above-mentioned anonymous Author, expreſly ſays, † ' I am ' now proving to you, that the *very ſame* Inſtitution which ' requires Circumciſion to be adminiſtred to Infants, re-' quires Baptiſm to be alſo adminiſtred to Infants, in that ' each of theſe Ordinances were appointed as a Seal of ' the very ſelf-ſame Covenant.' *Anſ.* 'Tis admirable to ' ſee the Length of ſome Men's *Logick!*

' Theſe Ordinances were appointed as Seals of the very ' ſelf-ſame Covenant, therefore they depend on the very ' ſame Inſtitution.' According to his Principles, with as much Truth he might as well argue, Circumciſion and the Lord's Supper are Seals of the very ſelf-ſame Covenant; therefore the very ſame Inſtitution which requires Circumciſion to be adminiſtred to Infants, requires the Lord's Supper to be alſo adminiſtred to Infants, in that each of theſe Ordinances (as our Opponents ſay) were appointed as a Seal of the very ſelf-ſame Covenant: This latter is as genuine as the former. But this Argument from the Inſtitution of Circumciſion, *&c.* to prove Infants Right to the Supper, is falſe; and ſo muſt their's be, from that Inſtitution, to prove their Right to Baptiſm.

I am yet fully of the Mind, our Opponents can never make it evident, that two diſtinct Ordinances in two diſtinct Adminiſtrations, depend on one and the very ſame Inſtitution. Now ſeeing there is no Inſtitution for baptizing Infants, as there was for circumciſing them, this Practice ſtill appears to be *unwarrantable*. The Expreſſions of the Worthy and Reverend Mr. *Hutchinſon*, are

† Divine Right, Page 20.

are pertinent here. * 'I ſay again, if Infant-baptiſm 'was commanded in the Command for Circumciſion of 'Infants, then by Analogy (for *Contrariorum, contraria 'eſt Ratio*) Infant-baptiſm muſt needs be abrogated and 'remanded in the Abrogation and Remanding of Cir-'cumciſion. And though I do not believe that the Pre-'cept to circumciſe Infants, was ſo much as a virtual or 'conſequential Command to baptize them, yet it is an 'Argument *ad Hominem* at leaſt; and I hope the *Pædo-'baptiſts* will be very willing to receive the ſame *Mea-'ſure* they give, and reſt ſatisfied in this, that the *Coun-'termand to circumciſe Infants, is a conſequential and vir-'tual Countermand to baptize them.* By all which it ap-'pears, that Infants Church-memberſhip is repeal'd, be-'cauſe the ſame Law that gave Being to it, is repeal'd,

But let us ſee how this Author exemplifies this to us, '† You hold your Lands (ſays he) by Patent made to 'your Grandfather, in the Reign of King *James* the 'Second, and ſealed with a red Seal; now ſhould King '*George* call in all the Patents granted in that Reign, to 'receive a new Confirmation, by annexing his great 'Seal to them, in white Wax; would there be any Oc-'caſion for a written Declaration, that this Seal confir-'med the Lands to you, and to your Children and 'Heirs, when that is expreſsly contain'd in the very Bo-'dy of the Original Patent, which is nothing alter'd, 'but has only receiv'd a new Confirmation by the Seal 'annexed to it?' It ſeems by all this Reaſoning, the Caſe is ſet in a very *familiar Light!* I ſuppoſe our Author does not intend that the former red Seal, is ſtill to this Patent, when he talks of a new Confirmation by a great Seal annexed to it, in white Wax; otherwiſe he muſt hold Circumciſion to be yet in Force. But when Circumciſion the red Seal was broken off by divine Authority, 'twas a ſure Sign the Patent was diſannulled; for as the Seal was aboliſhed, ſo was the Patent itſelf. Beſides if the old Patent was yet in Force, and nothing alter'd, Females can't be baptized; elſe there would be a conſiderable Alteration in the Body of the original Patent.

* Animadverſ. upon Mr. *Whiſton*'s Book, p. 26, † Divine Right, p. 21.

tent. The Caſe is plain: If the former Patent was faulty, and muſt be called in, and the Seal broken off, it was undoubtedly diſannulled; and 'tis as certain there is a Neceſſity of a new Patent, as well as a new Seal-which is much better exemplified by the Apoſtle in *Heb.* viii. in a *Goſpel* Light. So when we have followed our Opponents, with their *Ignis Fatuus*, or *Familiar* Light, thro' all their Windings and Turnings, we very happily come out much about the ſame Place; that Infants Church-memberſhip is long ſince at an End; that Infants have no Right to Baptiſm, from the Inſtitution of Circumciſion; and that Profeſſing-believers are the proper Subjects of this ſacred Ordinance.

Again. Mr. *F.* labours to obviate an Objection of his Opponents, which is, 'If Children are capable and 'ought to be admitted to Baptiſm, then ought they alſo 'to be admitted to the Sacrament of the Supper.' (Very 'right.) To which he replies; 'There is not the ſame 'Reaſon for both, Self-examination is required, in or-'der to partake of the Lord's Supper; but it is no where 'required in order to Baptiſm. *Anſ.* Repentance and Faith are always required in order to Baptiſm; and if he thinks that Perſons may repent and believe, without Self-examination, truly he has found out ſome new Kind of Repentance and Faith, which the Scripture knows not of. The ſame Method which he uſes to prove Infants Right to Baptiſm, any others may uſe to prove their Right to the Supper. For it is only telling, that all thoſe Places which ſpeak of Self-examination in order to partake of the Sacrament of the Supper, are addreſs'd only to grown Perſons, and not to Infants; then may *they* further urge, Why does he advance ſuch Scriptures againſt us, as will prove no more but that Perſons come to Years of Diſcretion ſhould not partake of the Lord's Supper without Self-examination, this we hold as firmly as he; but what is this to the Caſe of *Infants* Communion? And what can theſe Places prove in reſpect of Children?

By all the Arguments that Mr. *F.* would refute the Plea for Infants Communion, by the ſame Arguments

we

we would refute his Plea for Infants-baptiſm. Are Infants uncapable of one? ſo are they of the other. Is there no Command or Example for the one? neither is there for the other. Does the Duty of Self-examination exclude Infants from the Supper? ſo does that of Repentance and Faith exclude them alſo from Baptiſm. Do the Qualifications foregoing the Reception of the Supper, prove Believers to be the only Subjects of it? ſo do theſe Qualifications previous to Baptiſm, likewiſe prove Believers to be the only Subjects of *it*.

Neither does it help him to compare the Church to a *School, and ſuggeſt Infants are capable to be entred, tho' they are not capable of the moſt learned Exerciſes*---Unleſs he could make his Compariſon reach the Point in debate, and ſhew that Chriſt teacheth none who are out of the Church; which if it were ſo, then all grown Unbelievers muſt be brought into Church by Baptiſm, without any Inſtructions or Profeſſion of Faith at all; which is contrary to Mr. *F*'s declared Opinion, *p.* 65. and to the Practice of Chriſt whilſt on Earth; which was to make Diſciples firſt, before they were baptized, *John* iv. 1. and alſo to the conſtant and univerſal Practice of the Apoſtles afterwards, *Acts* ii. 41.

But inaſmuch as Chriſt teacheth Perſons by the Miniſtry of his Word, who are not Church-members; and that all the Members in the Apoſtolic Churches (as far as we can find) were taught before they were admitted; then it neceſſarily follows, that this Simile which Mr. *F.* uſeth, does neither confirm nor illuſtrate the Point he is upon. Seeing Infants are not born Church-members, nor can they be admitted before teaching, our Way is clear to affirm, that none but Proficients are to be entered into the Church, and the loweſt Claſs therein, are fit Subjects of the Lord's Supper: Or let Mr. *F.* give us any Inſtances to the Contrary in Apoſtolic Times; but this he cannot; therefore our Argument will appear to be founded on the Word of God, and our Practice in this Caſe according to the beſt Example: And it ſtill remains, if Infants are capable and ought to be admitted to Baptiſm, then ought they alſo to be admitted to the Lord's Supper.

More-

Moreover † the Author. of the late *Dialogue* ſays over and over, 'That little Ones or Infants do believe in 'Chriſt.' If ſo, I demand the Place of Scripture which forbids Church-Members which believe in Chriſt to receive the Lord's Supper, when their Life is unſtain'd with actual Sins, as in the Caſe of Infants? Was there any ſuch Thing practiſed by the Apoſtles as to debar Church Members, whom they look'd on to be Believers, from the Lord's Table? Surely, No. Let our Opponents act conſiſtent with their own Aſſertions, or elſe 'tis high Time for them to drop them.

Further, if theſe Men believe what they themſelves ſay, *That Infants are Believers in Chriſt*, what need is there for them to go about the *Buſh* to prove their Right of Baptiſm from *Abraham*'s Covenant and Circumciſion? Why don't they unanimouſly aſſert, they have a Right to Baptiſm upon their own perſonal Faith? And why ſhould Mr. *F.* tell us here and there, that we miſtake their Meaning, and that we argue againſt what they never aſſert? When our Opponents do aſſert, *That Infants are Believers in Chriſt*, Parents muſt convey Faith to them, or they have it ſome other Way; and why don't they tell us which Way Infants come by it? when the Apoſtle makes Hearing the Goſpel abſolutely neceſſary, in order to believe, *Rom.* x. 14,--17. Now we know that Infants are incapable to receive Faith by hearing the Word. It then behoves our Opponents to lead us into this *Myſtery*, how Infants come by their Faith, as well as what *kind* of Faith it is, if they don't allow it to be convey'd from their Parents. And what does Mr. *F.* make his Diſtinctions for, *of a Two-fold being in the Covenant*? when it is affirmed, That Infants are Believers in Chriſt. Will he ſay that Believers in Chriſt are not ſavingly in the Covenant of Grace, eſpecially when that anonymous Author puts them on a Par with believing Women, without any Diſtinction or Limitation *. And as uſeleſs is Mr. *Finley*'s Obſervation elſewhere: Says he, ‡ 'We ſpeak not 'of inherent Holineſs, or real gracious Habits, but of 'fœderal Holineſs.' Will he tell us, how ſome can have *Faith*

† Divine Right, p. 25, 28, 38, * Ib. p. 38. ‡ Charit. Plea, p. 46.

Faith in Chriſt, and not *have inherent Holineſs*? Or *have the Principles and Habit of ſaving Faith*, ‡ and yet not have a *real* and *gracious Habit of Faith*? It ſeems there is ſome Myſtery more than common, in this Buſineſs of Infant-baptiſm! When I can believe Aſſertions diametrically oppoſite to be true, probably I may fall in to believe the *jarring* Aſſertions of our *Opponents*. In the mean while, it appears we don't argue againſt what they never affirm, but ſtill ſay, *If Church-Members and their Seed are thus in the Covenant of Grace, they ſhall all be ſaved*; tho' Numbers of thoſe *believing Infants*, when grown, to all Appearance live and die mere Reprobates. But will our Opponents labour to extricate themſelves out of their Abſurdities (for I am perſwaded there is no Man can reconcile their Aſſertions) by ſaying, they mean not all the Infants of Church-Members, but only ſome of them. I *Anſ.* What convincing Evidence is there of one Infant's Faith more than another's? Let them inform us whereby they know it. If there is Ground for charitable Judgment of one, why not of all? when they plead that they are *all* fœderally Holy, and in Covenant together with their believing Parents. Which Side ſoever of their Aſſertions I turn up, it has ſtill written upon it, *Inconſiſtency* and *Falſhood*.

But it is plain our Opponents * do wretchedly abuſe (if not willingly wreſt) that Place of Scripture, *Matt.* xviii. 4, 5, 6. when they interpret the Place to mean Infants in Age; for 'tis here evident at firſt Sight, that Chriſt meant by *the little Ones which believe in him*, not Infants in Age, but Perſons in Years, who ſhould humble themſelves as that little Child. Men in humility, are here called little Ones which believe in Chriſt; which none will deny, but thoſe who are bent upon it, to abuſe Scripture at their Pleaſure, to countenance Falſhoods under a Cloak of abuſed Scriptures, and thereby to impoſe their Errors upon the World, under the Colour of Scripture Expreſſions: And for a Proteſtant, a Scholar, a Miniſter to do ſo, highly aggravates the Guilt of ſuch *horrid* Impieties.

The

‡ Divine Right, p. 33. * Divine Right, p. 25.

The *Aſſembly* on the Place ſay, *ver.* 3. *Except ye be converted.* ‘ A kind of Speech taken from the *Hebrews*, ‘ to ſet out Repentance, which is the altering of a Man's ‘ Courſe for the better, as he that is gone out of the Way, ‘ turns back to return into the right Way again. Or it ‘ may be more particularly meant here, of turning from ‘ ambitious Thoughts, which then poſſeſſed them, to ‘ humility of Mind. [*Become as little Children*] not in ‘ Ignorance, but in Lowlineſs of Spirit, 1 *Cor.* xiv. 20.

‘ [Ver. 4. *Whoſoever therefore ſhall humble himſelf as ‘ this little Child*] That is, ſo humbleth himſelf, as ‘ that for humble Diſpoſition he become like this Child; ‘ for the Child, to ſpeak properly, could not humble ‘ himſelf. Whoſoever doth not think highly of himſelf ‘ no more than this little Child doth. Humbleneſs of ‘ Mind is the right Way to Pre-eminence, *ver.* 5. One ‘ ſuch little Child. [One LIKE ſuch a Child, in the ‘ Quality before mentioned, *Pſal.* cxxxi., 2. and cxix. ‘ 141. *Ver.* 6. *But whoſo ſhall offend*] *Mark* ix. 42. ‘ *Luke* xvii. 1, 2. [*one of theſe little Ones*] ſhall, by ‘ Wrong or Contempt (which oft deters and turns Men ‘ aſide from Profeſſion of Piety, or pious Courſes) offend ‘ ſuch an humbled Soul, *ver.* 5. Men being moſt prone ‘ to deal ſo, with Perſons ſo diſpoſed.’

The Continuers of *Pool*'s Annotations on *Matt.* xviii. 5. ‘ Whoſo receiveth ſuch a little Child, that is an hum- ‘ ble Chriſtian. In the next Verſe it is opened, by one ‘ that believeth in me.

Mr. *Cradock*, thus: ‡ ‘ Our Saviour being minded to ‘ cure this *Pride* and *Ambition* in his Diſciples, calls ‘ them about him, and ſitting down, preaches unto them ‘ the Doctrine of true *Humility*, declaring and ſhewing, ‘ that every one that rightly deſires true Honour and ‘ Dignity, muſt abaſe, and humble, and caſt down him- ‘ ſelf (even below others) in his own Eſtimation and Be- ‘ haviour, and muſt be ſerviceable to the Good of others, ‘ *Mark* ix. 35. Then for the better Illuſtration of this ‘ Doctrine, he makes Uſe of a ſignificant *Emblem* (as ‘ the Prophets of old were wont to teach the People, ſee

‡ Harmony of Evang.

'ſee *Jer.* xxvii. 2.) ſhewing them a little Child, and taking him into his Arms, and ſetting before them therein an Example of Humility and Meekneſs, which they ought to imitate; plainly telling them, that the Way to be great in his Kingdom, is to be humble; and therefore, except they be converted, that is, repent of this their Pride and Ambition, and become as little Children in *Humility* of Mind, and ſincere Innocency, they can neither be Members of his Kingdom of Grace here, nor ſhall enter into his Kingdom of Glory hereafter.' I need not ſtand to ſay any Thing more on this Head, the Matter being ſo clear, even ſelf-evident, that Chriſt meant not Infants in Age by theſe Expreſſions, but Men of humble Diſpoſitions, *&c.* I ſhall proceed to obſerve a whole Heap of abſurd Aſſertions in that Dialogue: ‡ 'You require (ſays the Author) expreſs New-Teſtament Proof, that Infants are to be baptized; and I require of you expreſs New-teſtament Proof that Women ſhould partake of the Lord's Supper: Prove the latter by what Arguments you pleaſe, and I will prove the former by the ſame.'

Let us try then how the Matter will turn out; I *Anſ.* in the Words of the Rev. Mr. *Rees*, * '1. As to Womens coming to the *Lord's Table*, there are no Qualifications required of them, but what are very conſiſtent with their State; whereas in Point of Baptiſm, there are Faith and Repentance required every where; the want of which altogether diſqualifies Infants, and excludes them this Ordinance, if we keep to the Rules of the Goſpel. 2. To put the Matter out of Doubt, we have a clear Account of *Womens* having commun'd at *breaking* of *Bread* with the Church at *Jeruſalem*. *Acts* i. 13, 14. *And when they were come in, they went up into an upper Room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the Son of Alpheus, and Simon Zealotes, and Judas the Brother of James. Theſe all continued with one Accord in Prayer and Supplication, with the Women, and Mary the Mother of Jeſus, and with his Brethren.* v. 15. '---*the*

‡ Page 38. * Infant Baptiſm no Inſtitution of Chriſt. Page 9a.

'---*the Number of the Names together were about an Hun-*
'*dred and twenty.* Chap. ii. 42. *And they continued*
'*ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine and Fellowſhip, and in*
'*breaking of Bread and in Prayers.* v. 44. *And all that*
'*believed were together,*-- v. 46. *And they continuing daily*
'*with one Accord in the Temple, and* breaking Bread *from*
'*Houſe to Houſe,* v. 47. --*And the Lord added to the*
'*Church daily ſuch as ſhould be ſaved.* Now if Mr. *W.* can
'produce but a Quarter-part of ſuch a Scripture Hiſtory
'of *Infants* being *baptized*, I promiſe freely to be of his
'Opinion.' And ſo ſay I to that anonymous Gentleman. But ſays our Author, 'Are Women in Covenant? ſo
'are the Infants of believing Parents.' This Aſſertion is falſe. For Women are in Covenant by true Faith, wrought of the Holy Ghoſt in their Souls, by hearing the Goſpel, *Acts* xvii. 4, 12. compare *John* iii. 36. *Eph.* iii. 17. but Infants are not ſo. 'Are Women Believers?
'ſo are ſome Infants.' This is alſo falſe, as I have ſhewn: Neither can this Author (whoever he is) make good the Contrary.---'Are Women Diſciples of Chriſt?
'ſo are ſome Infants.' *Anſ.* 'Tis not eaſy to find any Word too hard to call this Aſſertion by, ſeeing it is diametrically oppoſite to the Sayings of Chriſt; *Luke* xiv. 27. --*Whoſoever doth not bear his Croſs, and come after me,* CANNOT *be my Diſciple*; and to all the Characters given in Scripture of his Diſciples. 'Are Women part of the
'Nations to whom the Miniſters of the Goſpel are com-
'miſſion'd and ſent? ſo are Infants.' What pretty Buſineſs this Gentleman would make of it, to go and preach to a Houſe-full of Infants! I believe he would ſoon be convinced, that a Company of good Nurſes would do more Good by far amongſt them, than he could do with all his *Divinity-Lectures.* Truly 'tis not a little ſurprizing, that we ſhould be entertain'd by our Opponents (who would be deemed Men of Senſe and Learning) with ſuch bulky Heaps of perfect Nonſenſe. Can any one in his Wits imagine, that Chriſt commiſſion'd and ſent his Apoſtles to do what was utterly impoſſible, *viz.* to teach Infants the Doctrines of his Goſpel? and none were to be baptized according to the Order of the Commiſſion,

but

but thoſe who were firſt taught. 'Have Women a 'Claim to have the Covenant ſeal'd to them? ſo have 'the Infants of believing Parents likewiſe.' *Anſ.* Women were baptized, according to the Order of the Goſpel, *Acts* viii. 12. but Believers Infants are neither in the Covenant, as our Opponents alledge, nor have any Right to Baptiſm; as I have already ſhewn.

When this Author's Hand was in, he might with equal Truth have ſaid, Are Women to partake of the Sacrament of the Supper? ſo are ſome Infants. He further ſays, 'I have alſo ſhewn you, that *Lydia* and her 'Houſhold, that the Jaylor and all his, and that the 'Houſhold of *Stephanus* were all baptized: And there is 'no Room to Doubt, but that in theſe Families (at leaſt 'in ſome of them) there were ſuch Children, as were 'not capable perſonally and explicitely to covenant for 'themſelves.'--- If I may uſe his Words, there is no Room to doubt, but he abuſes theſe Paſſages, to countenance his Scriptureleſs Opinion and Practice. As to *Lydia*, ſhe was a Merchant Woman, and certainly muſt have Help about her, to carry on that fatiguing Buſineſs; but there is not the leaſt Account that ſhe was married, and had Children, *Acts* xvi. 14.-- The Jaylor *believed in God with all his Houſe*, Acts xvi. 34. *The Houſe of* Stephanus *was the firſt Fruits of* Achaia, 1 *Cor.* xvi. 15. *i. e.* he and his Family were ſome of the firſt that were converted by the Miniſtry of the Goſpel in that Country. Upon the whole, there does not appear the leaſt Ground from Scripture for Infant-baptiſm, by any Thing as yet produced or urged by this anonymous Author, more than others. But why tarry I to remark on ſuch Things as are in themſelves evidently falſe? I return, and come to Mr. *Finley*'s 5th, and laſt Aſſertion, which is, 'That Baptiſm ſucceeds in the Room of Circumciſion. This is evident from *Col.* ii. 11. 12. *In whom alſo ye are circumciſed with the Circumciſion made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh, by the Circumciſion of Chriſt: Buried with him in Baptiſm, &c.*' Having already examin'd Mr. *F*'s foregoing Aſſertions, and ſhewn the Places of Scripture he advances for Infants

Right to Baptiſm, don't conclude for him, there is the leſs Need to dwell long upon this laſt Aſſertion; wherein he labours to ſhew that Baptiſm is come in the Room of Circumciſion, and every Way anſwers the Deſign and Uſe of it---Then ſums up his Matter thus, 'Seeing the 'Infants of Church-members, were circumciſed, there 'cannot be a clearer Conſequence, than they ſhould alſo 'be baptized.' *Reply.* Juſt as if there was no Regard to be had unto the different Diſpenſations, or unto the Order and Laws of God, reſpecting each of theſe Ordinances; but of his own Head, without any Warrant from Chriſt, concludes that Infants are to be baptized. Which Conſequence is to be rejected, becauſe it is not confirmed with "Thus ſaith the Lord." But let us conſider the Grounds and Reaſons of his Concluſion, *viz.* That Baptiſm is come in the Room of Circumciſion, and ſerves for the ſame Ends, and one Reaſon (if not the chief) which Mr. *F.* offers to confirm it, is to this Purpoſe, *viz.* 'That the Apoſtle deſigns to ſhew that Baptiſm anſwers 'to Circumciſion, and ſucceeds it; or elſe, that his 'Argument does not refute the *Judaizing* Teachers: 'To ſay the laſt would be blaſphemous, therefore the 'former is true.' If the Caſe was ſo, how ſhould the Apoſtle refute the *Judaizing* Teachers, in their Plea for the *Bindingneſs* of other *Moſaic* Ceremonies, under the New-Teſtament Diſpenſation, without ſhewing that there was ſome Ordinance or Ceremony, anſwering to each of them, and to ſucceed them, inorder to quell the Tumults of thoſe turbulent Men? And conſequently make the new Diſpenſation as cumberſome as the Old. Does Mr. *F.* think that thoſe *Legal* Teachers were not as cloſely attach'd to other *Moſaic* Ceremonies, as they were (or could be) to Circumciſion? *Acts* xxi. 21, 28. What kind of Satisfaction would it be to them, or Refutation of their Plea, to tell them Baptiſm ſucceeds Circumciſion; but other *Moſaic* Ceremonies are aboliſhed, and Chriſtians compleat in Chriſt without them, or any coming in their Room to anſwer them? How readily (according to Mr. *F.*) might they return, *and ſay that the Church was in a worſe Condition than before, and her*

Pri-

Priviledges abridg'd, if ſhe has no Ordinances to anſwer to theſe Offerings, Sacrifices, Purifications, *&c.* once in uſe. And if only ſome * few comparatively, of thoſe baptized, were to partake of the Sacrament of the Supper; whereas formerly all the Nation of the *Jews*, who were circumciſed, were to eat of the Paſſover. In a Word, if the Apoſtle intended what our Opponents urge from this Place, inſtead of refuting the *Judaizing* Teachers, he would only have form'd an Argument, to be expos'd to more Perplexities and Intricacies. But let it be obſerved, it was the Apoſtle's Method, and a ſufficient Refutation to the Pleas of thoſe *Judaizing* Teachers, to open unto them that Chriſt the Subſtance being come, there was no more any Uſe for thoſe Ceremonies, Offerings, Types, and amongſt the reſt Circumciſion itſelf; for Believers are compleat in Chriſt without them, as the Apoſtle teſtifies, *Col.* ii. 10. Moreover 'tis manifeſt the Apoſtle means by (Circumciſion of Chriſt) the Renovation of the Soul, Spiritual Operation on the Heart, effected by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt, in mortifying the Body of Sin, and implanting in the Soul, a Principle of Divine Life---Said therefore to be *done without Hands*, *in Oppoſition to Circumciſion in the Fleſh done with Hands*. And not as Mr. *F.* aſſerts, that Baptiſm is here called the *Circumciſion of Chriſt*: For if ſo, then it would follow, that Baptiſm is abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation; for ſo is the Circumciſion here mentioned.

2. That Baptiſm takes away Sins; or at leaſt, that there is ſome Virtue in it, co-operating with the Grace of the Spirit, *in putting off the Body of Sin*.--- Which Aſſertions are conſiderably too big for *Diſſenters* to ſwallow, let who will beſides venture upon them. Therefore what Mr. *F.* ſays here, is falſe. Neither will it help him to ſay, that the Thing ſignified, is here called by the Name of the Sign; for that would prove that the Perſons to be baptized, were only ſuch according to the Nature, Intent, and Deſign of this Ordinance; who

* *i. e.* Upon a Supposition that Infants were to be baptized, as our Opponents urge.

had this Work of Grace wrought on their Hearts; and ſo acting Faith in Chriſt in the Reception of this Sign, both in dying to Sin, and riſing to Newneſs of Life (repreſented by their Burial in the Water, and riſing out of it) at the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, which Infants are incapable of; therefore not the Subjects of this Ordinance: If he means thus, his Aſſertion, that Baptiſm comes in the Room of Circumciſion, will do him no Service in the Caſe; nor hurt the Truth which we profeſs to maintain, that thoſe who have the Body of Sin put off, are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm.

But againſt his Clear Conſequence (as he calls it) I would further argue, If Baptiſm ſucceeds Circumciſion in the Manner our Opponents urge, 'tis ſtrange that *Paul* and *Barnabas* in their Diſſention and Diſputation with the *Judaizing* Teachers at *Antioch* (*Acts* 15.) who ſo vehemently urg'd the Neceſſity of Circumciſion, did not once think of this ready and powerful Way to refute them, by ſaying Circumciſion is aboliſhed; but Baptiſm is come in the Room of it, and anſwers the ſame Ends. And when *Paul* and *Barnabas*, with others, came up to *Jeruſalem* about this Queſtion, 'tis ſtill ſtrange, when they and the Apoſtles and Elders met together, to conſider of this Matter, that in all their Diſcourſing about the Queſtion, they never once thought on ſuch a ready Way to refute the *Judaizing* Teachers, as our Opponents preſcribe. Now if there had been ſuch a Thing as Baptiſm to ſucceed Circumciſion, and Infants to be baptized, How can any One imagine that this *truly honourable* and *wiſe* Aſſembly, ſhould not have thought of it, and immediately fallen upon it, as the ready Way to refute their *Opponents*; eſpecially when there was ſuch a fair Opportunity preſenting itſelf; For the Occaſion would have led them directly upon it, had there been ſuch a Thing then known; and we ſhould have heard ſomething of it, in their Concluſions ſent to the Churches perplex'd with thoſe *Judaizing* Teachers. Now, I ſay, can any Reaſon be thought of, why the Apoſtles and Elders made no mention of any ſuch Thing as our Opponents urge, neither in their Debates in this Council, nor

in

in their Letters ſent to the Churches, but only this, That they received no ſuch *Doctrine* from Chriſt, and therefore tranſmitted no ſuch *Cuſtom* to be obſerved by the Churches of Chriſt? And how any Man can think otherwiſe, and not reflect great Imprudence and Unfaithfulneſs upon the Apoſtles (if the Caſe be as our Opponents ſay) I can't imagine. Neither is there any Colour of Reaſon to ſupport the *Conſequence* of our Antagoniſts from this Text, that *Paul* here aſſerts Baptiſm to come in the Room of Circumciſion, and that Infants are to be baptized, when he himſelf was preſent in that Council, and in the Reſult of their whole Diſcourſe there was no ſuch Thing concluded. The Caſe depends thus, Whether is it ſafeſt to cleave to Mr. *F*'s Conſequence, That Infants are to be baptized; or to that Holy Aſſembly which concluded no ſuch Thing? let the Reader judge.

And here I have an Opportunity to preſent Mr. *F.* with a much clearer Conſequence than his own; namely, That Infants are not to be baptized, becauſe this wiſe Aſſembly mention'd nor decreed no ſuch Thing. (Neither indeed have we any Inſtances of it in the Word of God) The World alſo may be pleas'd to obſerve the Weakneſs and Falſity of Mr. *F*'s Reaſonings, that the *Judaizing* Teachers could not be refuted, unleſs Baptiſm anſwers to Circumciſion, and ſucceeds it, when you ſee this Aſſembly refuted them without mentioning or aſſerting any ſuch Thing; or elſe the *Judaizing* Teachers were not refuted. *To ſay the laſt would be blaſphemous, therefore the former is true.*

There is nothing more that offers itſelf on this Head, unleſs I ſhould juſt obſerve, that Infants are no Ways capable Subjects of Baptiſm, as they were of Circumciſion; becauſe that left a Sign in the Fleſh, but Baptiſm does not: Hearing the Goſpel, Faith, and Repentance, are always required in order to Baptiſm; not ſo in the Caſe of Circumciſion: In that there was no Word added to the Sign, but in Baptiſm the Word is an eſſential Part of the Sacrament; 'tis therefore neceſſary that the Perſons baptized, ſhould in receiving this Sacrament, exerciſe Faith in God the Father, as their Father, in the Son, as

their Redeemer, and in the Holy Ghoſt, as their Sanctifier; and let it be always remember'd, that there was God's Command for Infants Circumciſion, but there is none for Infants Baptiſm. Hence Infants are every Way incapable of this Holy Ordinance.

Now let us follow Mr. *F.* towards his Concluſion; but in his Way he meets with a Set of Objections, *in which* (he ſays) *his Antagoniſts chiefly triumph*: And very good Reaſon for it; bleſſed be the King of Zion, that he has given us Cauſe to triumph in the Clearneſs and Evidence of his Will, notwithſtanding the violent Aſſaults made to darken his Counſel, and wreſt his Word.

The Objections which (he ſays) muſt not be wholly paſſed over, are "That we find *Faith* and *Repentance* 'always required in Order to *Baptiſm*; and thoſe who 'were admitted to the Ordinance, were oblig'd to profeſs the ſame, and confeſs their Sins. So in *Matt.* iii. 6. '*They were baptized of him in* Jordan, *confeſſing their Sins.* '*Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Teaching* is ſet before *Baptizing.* '*Mark.* xvi. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall* 'be ſaved. *Acts* xvi. 15, 33, 34. *Lydia* and the Jaylor were baptized upon believing and profeſſing their 'Faith. *Acts* ii. 38. *Peter* requir'd Repentance of 'his Hearers in Order to Baptiſm. *Acts* viii. 37. '*Philip* would not baptize the Eunuch until he profeſſed 'his Faith.' In Anſwer to which, I obſerve that our 'Opponents themſelves muſt own, 1. That theſe Scriptures which they ſo much urge, are addreſſed only to grown 'Perſons, and not to Infants, who are incapable of 'being taught by Preaching.' To which I reply: This we readily own, and therefore ſay, if according to the Scripture, Faith and Repentance are *always* required in order to Baptiſm, then what Sort of Baptiſm is *that*, which requires no Faith and Repentance to go before it? Why ſurely not a SCRIPTURAL ONE. What is it that blinds theſe Men's Eyes, that they ſhould think Infant-baptiſm to be right? when they themſelves can't find any ſuch kind of Baptiſm in the whole Word of God. People are really to be pitied, and lamented over, who make all this Stir about a Ceremony, after a Manner

ner confeſs'd by themſelves to be without Foundation in Scripture.

Are our pitiful Opponents bent upon it, and fully reſolved to follow the Tradition of their Fathers (which muſt be own'd on all Hands to be Scriptureleſs) in direct Oppoſition to the Laws and Order of the King of *Zion*?

May the Lord incline their Hearts to turn from their awful Wanderings to his ſacred Truth; then ſhould we take ſweet Counſel together, and walk to the Houſe of God in Company.

2. If all theſe Scriptures are addreſſed only to grown Perſons, then the Commiſſion refers to them alſo, wherein *teaching* is ſet before *baptizing*; for this is one of the Places Mr. *F.* cites. Hence, if Infants are incapable of being taught by Preaching, as Mr. *F*, ſays they be, there is no Warrant then to baptize them, unleſs Mr. *F.* could produce another Commiſſion than that which Chriſt gave to his Diſciples and their Succeſſors; which we know he cannot; There is therefore no Authority from Chriſt to baptize Infants; becauſe in the Commiſſion, *Teaching* is ſet before *Baptizing*; and Mr. *F.* pleads for it (and would have us own it too) that all theſe Places refer to grown Perſons and not to Infants. Mr. *F.* would do well to conſider, according to his own Way of Reaſoning, that all the Infants he ever has baptized, and ever ſhall, he does it without any Authority from Chriſt; and let him conſider what dreadful Preſumption he is guilty of in ſo doing; and alſo of his taking the Name of the bleſſed Trinity ſo much in vain!

'*2dly* (ſays he) That they were Addreſſes to ſuch 'grown Perſons as were not Chriſtians before, but either '*Jews* or *Pagans*.'

Reply. What he would gain by this Part of his Anſwer, I can't readily imagine. That Place, *Matt.* iii. 3. —contains an Addreſs of *John* the Baptiſt to the *Jews*, the *Phariſees*, and *Sadducees*, who were then in *Abraham*'s Covenant, and had a Right to have their Children circumciſed, becauſe this Ceremony was not then abrogated: And if *Abraham*'s Covenant was a pure Covenant of Grace, in the Manner our Opponents plead for,

it

it does not ſound very well, to ſay that grown wicked Perſons, as thoſe *Jews* were, who (Mr. *F.* ſays) were no Chriſtians, were yet in the Covenant of Grace. Truly I don't underſtand ſuch a Being in the Covenant of Grace; and to aſſert ſuch Notions, ſerves for nothing elſe but to faſten People in deſtructive Deluſions.

'3*dly*, (ſays he) They muſt own, there is a wide Difference between gathering and forming a Church from amongſt thoſe who are ignorant of Chriſtianity, and a Church already gathered, and form'd, and inſtructed; for in proſelyting *Jews* or *Pagans* to Chriſtianity, they muſt of Neceſſity be taught before they can either profeſs their Faith in the Doctrines of it, or be admitted to Baptiſm: But it will not follow that none can be admitted to Baptiſm without teaching in a Church already conſtituted.' *Anſ.* There is no Neceſſity appearing, that we muſt own all that is here ſuggeſted; tho' we ſhould and do grant there is a Difference between gathering a Church, and a Church already gathered and conſtituted. The Matter may be ſet in a clear Light by reſolving a Query or two.

Quer. 1. What is it to gather a Church? *Anſ.* 'Tis to preach the Goſpel for the Inſtruction of the Ignorant in the Doctrines of Grace and Salvation, whereby ſuch are prepared to be fit Matter of a Goſpel Viſible Church, *Acts* xxvi. 17, 18. *Acts* viii. 5, 6, 12.

Quer. 2. What is a Church gathered, form'd, and conſtituted? *Anſ.* A Church gathered, form'd, and conſtituted, is a ſelect Number of baptized Believers, incorporated together, profeſſing to be united to Chriſt by his Spirit, and to walk together by mutual Conſent, in Subjection to Chriſt their Head, in the Fellowſhip and Communion of all the Ordinances of the Goſpel. *Acts* ii. 41. *Eph.* iv. 15, 16. 1 *Cor.* vi. 17. Chap. i. 9. *Eph.* i. 19, 20. *Acts* ix. 31. 2 *Cor.* xiii. 11. *Eph.* v. 24. *Acts* ii. 42, 46.

How then can Mr. *F.* thruſt in his Aſſertion, that it will not follow, none can be admitted to Baptiſm, without Teaching in a Church already conſtituted? when he can't make appear that Infants are Church-members,

without contradicting the expreſs Teſtimony of Scripture concerning the New Teſtament Church, both in Reſpect of its Matter and Form: and alſo involve his Argument in the greateſt Abſurdities and Inconſiſtencies, as I have already ſhewn.

Infants cannot be baptized upon Profeſſion of their Faith; they cannot be any Part of a conſtituted Church, not being inſtructed; they can't profeſs Union with Chriſt, nor Subjection to him; neither are they capable to walk together with others in the Fellowſhip of the Goſpel.

Does our Author think that the Infants of Church Members are not as ignorant of Chriſtianity, as he can ſuppoſe either *Jews* or *Pagans* to be? Whatever he thinks or ſays, there is ſufficient Evidence that the Infants of Church-members are as ignorant of the Principles of Chriſtianity, and their Natures as perverſe as any others in the World, and therefore need (as they grow up) very careful and diligent Inſtructions in the Doctrines of it, before there can be any Pretence for their Right to Baptiſm, or any tolerable Conformity to the Order given by Chriſt, in his unvariable Commiſſion: And to deny this, is to deviate from the plain Rule and Order of the Goſpel.

"*4thly.* (ſays he) That there is a Difference between 'the firſt Inſtitution of an Ordinance, and the continued 'Adminiſtration of it afterwards; for Parents or grown 'Perſons muſt firſt be the Subjects of a new Inſtitution, 'and not Infants: But it will not follow, becauſe Pa'rents muſt firſt be the Subjects, therefore Children muſt 'not afterwards be admitted at all: Yea ſuch a Conſe'quence is quite Ridiculous!' *Anſ.* What is Ridiculous? to follow the firſt Inſtitution of an Ordinance, or leave that, and follow Men's Adminiſtration of it afterwards, *different* from the firſt Inſtitution? Let Mr. *F.* judge which deſerves moſt to bear that odious Title, *Ridiculous*! How impertinent is the Inſtitution of Circumciſion mentioned here! Does he think this a parallel Caſe with what he is upon? Was not the Circumciſion of Infants expreſly commanded at the firſt Inſtitution of that Ordinance,

nance, *Gen.* xvii. 10, 11, 12. ? And agreeable thereunto, *Abraham* and all his Houſhold were circumciſed the ſelf-ſame Day, according to God's Order: But there was no ſuch Thing, either in the firſt Inſtitution of Baptiſm, or in the continued Adminiſtration of it afterward. Does not Mr. *F.* well know, that he can't find any Inſtitution for Infants Baptiſm, as there was for Infants Circumciſion; and why would he labour to maintain his Practice by this inſipid Argument, when the Caſes are no Ways parallel? And if he does not acknowledge this, I demand the Place where the Inſtitution of Infant-baptiſm may be found, or that gives an Account of its continued Adminiſtration afterwards?

He further aſks us, 'How would this Argument con-'clude, *viz.* That becauſe *Abraham* was circumciſed af-'ter he was come of Age, therefore all Infants were ex-'cluded?' I *Anſ.* It would conclude much like his Argument for Infant-baptiſm; namely, The Poſterity of *Abraham* in ſo doing, would act contrary to God's Direction, in not circumciſing their Infants, as our Opponents go contrary to his Direction in baptizing them, *Mark* xvi. 15, 16. 2 *Tim.* i. 13. ſeeing that profeſſing Believers are the only Subjects of Baptiſm.

I don't begrudge him all the Confirmation his Argument gets by the Inſtance of *Iſhmael*'s Poſterity; who, as he ſays, did not circumciſe their Children 'till the 13th Year of their Age, becauſe *Iſhmael* was of that Age at the firſt Inſtitution of Circumciſion. If deviating from the firſt Inſtitution and due Adminiſtration of an Ordinance, puts Perſons on a *Par* with *Iſhmael*'s Poſterity, truly we have many *Iſhmaelites* round us in our Day.

Mr. *F.* is not willing to leave his Anſwers to theſe Objections, without putting his Opponents upon a ſecond Conſideration of them. It ſeems he is mighty willing to get the Force of theſe Scriptures turn'd aſide ſome Way or other, that inſtead of following theſe Texts (and others) which do deſignedly treat of the Ordinance (which are ſurely the Places moſt likely to guide us to a right Underſtanding of the proper Subjects of it) he might bring in his Conſequences for Infant-baptiſm, taken from ſuch

Places

Places of Scripture as treat quite on other Subjects; but to do him the Pleaſure, let us conſider the Matter over again, 1. " Do theſe Texts prove a Repeal of Infants Church-memberſhip?" Yes, much ſtronger than all his Conſequences prove their Right to Baptiſm; becauſe a Perſonal Faith, and Fruits of Repentance, are always requir'd in order to Baptiſm, Infants being incapable of either, therefore they have nothing to do with it. 2. 'Do 'not all theſe Scriptures refer to grown Perſons? And 'what then can they prove in reſpect to Children?' *Anſ.* Therefore none but the Perſons they refer to, have any Right to the Ordinance, methinks is no bad Conſequence.

3. " Can our Antagoniſts charge us with baptizing ungoſpelliz'd grown Perſons, without Teaching, or Profeſſion of Faith.' *Anſ.* Our Conteſt is not about their baptizing grown Perſons, how they deal with them they muſt beſt know; but if current Reports be true, they baptize ſome grown Perſons, who (as well as ſome Infants whoſe Parents) are not admitted to the Lord's Table: And what Sort of Goſpelliz'd Perſons ſuch are, let themſelves judge. But to the Caſe in Hand; we charge them with baptizing ungoſpelliz'd little Perſons, for ſo Infants are, unleſs they are born goſpelliz'd; or ſuck in the Principles of the Goſpel, with their Mother's Milk; for they can't be ſo by Teaching, nor by any ſuppos'd Right in the Covenant; for to be goſpelliz'd imports one that has embrac'd the Doctrines of the Goſpel. There is therefore very good and ſufficient Reaſon why we advance theſe Scriptures againſt thoſe whoſe daily Practice it is to baptize ungoſpelliz'd Perſons.

There is one Argument more which Mr. *F.* lays very great Streſs on, as tho' it would help him in what he endeavours to propagate, and it runs after this Manner, 'Now it is a plain Way of Reaſoning, that which would 'be the moſt proper Addreſs, even tho' Infants were de-'ſign'd to be included, cannot poſſibly prove them 'to be excluded; but to require Profeſſion of Faith 'from the Parents in order to Baptiſm, was the moſt pro-'per, even tho' their Infants were deſign'd to be inclu-'ded: Therefore to require Profeſſion of Faith from Pa-

'rents

'rents in order to Baptiſm, does not prove their Chil-'dren to be excluded.' *Anſ.* This Argument is a mere *Gingle* of Words, and won't bear up what he would build upon it, unleſs he could make appear, that the Order of the Commiſſion, *Mat.* xxviii. (for that is one of the Places referred to) is to be obſerved only when Miniſters are to preach to unchriſtianiz'd *Jews* and *Pagans*; which to aſſert is quite abſurd. Mr. *F.* muſt not think hard that I do hereby call upon him to ſhew his Authority, for his forſaking the Order of the Commiſſion, which requires Teaching before Baptizing, when he has to do with the numerous Offspring of Church-members? Pray what Scripture or Reaſon has he to ſupport him in his Perverſion of the Words of God, by ſetting *Baptizing* before *Teaching*, to ſuit his Notion of Infant-baptiſm, when he has to do with Believers Infants? Is the Commiſſion of our Lord a mere *Leaden* Rule, and a *moveable Dial*, that may be *bent* and *turn'd* any Way, to countenance the moſt *crooked* Aſſertions, and *Scriptureleſs* Opinions? Far be it from us to think ſo. Notwithſtanding all the Endeavours of our Opponents to prove the Right of Infants to Baptiſm, they'll never be able to ſhew that they have a right Subject of this Ordinance, but (One who is firſt taught) as the Commiſſion preſcribes; which is the ſtated unvariable Rule to Miniſters in the Execution of their Truſt, throughout all Ages; however ſome, thro' the Prevalency of Education or Cuſtom, may deviate from it. Further, What a bold Reflection is here caſt on the Divine Wiſdom of the great Law-giver, by this Kind of Reaſoning! As if Chriſt could not direct his Miniſters to uſe another more proper Addreſs, if it had been his Will Infants ſhould be baptized: Beſides the Argument with greater Force of Reaſon and Scripture, turns in our Favour: Unleſs Mr. *F.* could make appear, that another Kind of Addreſs could have been more properly uſed, when Infants were deſign'd to be excluded from Baptiſm.

What Mr. *F.* offers for Illuſtration of this Argument, *viz.* 'That was he to preach among the *Pagans*, he does 'not ſee how he could *avoid* ſpeaking to them in the

'Strain

'Strain of the above quoted Scriptures.' is no better than if he ſhould tell us, that were he to preach among the *Pagans*, he would obſerve and follow the Order of Chriſt's Commiſſion, and the Practice of the Apoſtles; but that now he acts inconſiſtent with both: And what can be more abſurd?

This Gentleman ſeems very fond of ſtarting Objections, that he may enjoy the Pleaſure of anſwering them. If none contend for Perſons to be baptized at Thirty Years of Age, as Chriſt was, to what Purpoſe ſhould Mr. *F.* ſet himſelf to oppoſe that which *none contend for nor practiſe*? This looks as if he wanted ſomething to do, and he might be ſure to come off with a Victory, when he undertakes to anſwer an Objection which no-body makes but himſelf. If thoſe other Objections which he paſſes over in Silence, were of the ſame Nature with this, he might well *think 'twas Time ill-ſpent to ſolve them.* However, by the Way, it may be obſerved, that it is not unſafe nor diſhonourable to imitate the great Captain of our Salvation, *viz.* That one come to Years of Underſtanding, ſhould be the Subject of this ſacred Ordinance, which accords very well with his Example, and is perfectly agreeable with his revealed Mind and Will.

Here Mr. *F.* folds down the Leaf upon his former Arguments, and enters upon other *Topicks*, in Defence of his received *Tenet* of Infant-Baptiſm, and introduces himſelf thus; 'I have avoided quoting the Teſtimonies of 'the primitive Fathers, on Purpoſe to ſtop their ground-'leſs *Clamour*, that we derive our Practice of Infant 'Baptiſm from Tradition: They may ſee their Mi-'ſtake, we derive it from Scripture, and are under no 'Neceſſity of having Recourſe to human Teſtimony for 'its Defence.' Anſ. *Incidit in Scyllam, cupiens vitare Charybdim.* Whilſt our Opponents would fain ſhun one Extream, they unhappily fall on the other. Pray what Places of Scripture are thoſe which they derive Infant Baptiſm from? for he joins with us, that all thoſe Places of Scripture which require Repentance and Faith, in order to Baptiſm, are *addreſs'd only to grown Perſons, and not to Infants.* And we find no Inſtance of Baptiſm's being adminiſtred

miniſtred without ſuch Qualifications; then it plainly follows, Infant-Baptiſm is unſcriptural. How can Mr. *F.* ſay they derive it from Scripture, when no ſuch Thing is found there? Does he think, for him and others to father that upon the Scripture which it does not own, or to wreſt Scripture for its Defence, won't be greater Grounds and Cauſe of *Clamour* (as he calls it) than if ſuch a Practice was carried on merely on the Account of Tradition? Wherever they derive it from, we are quite inſenſible that we lay under any Miſtake in this Matter: Neither has Mr. *F.* convinc'd us, that Infant-Baptiſm can at all pretend to any Divine Original. But then he tells us 'it was all along practiſed by the Church, from 'the beginning of Chriſtianity, and was received from 'the Apoſtles: We have the Suffrage of no leſs a Man 'than *Ireneus*, whoſe Maſter *Polycarp* was the Apoſtle '*John*'s Diſciple; who tells us, (*That the Church learn'd* '*from the Apoſtles to baptize Children.*') *Anſ.* It has not as yet been made evident, that Infant-Baptiſm was all along practiſed by the Church from the Beginning of Chriſtianity, or for a conſiderable Time after it. Mr. *F.* might have known, that *Proteſtants*, eſpecially *Diſſenters*, profeſs to pay no great Reſpect to any Practice handed down, under the *ſpecious Title* of *Tradition Apoſtolical*, which is not mention'd in Holy Scripture; neither can we find in our Hearts to ſhew much Regard to Infant-Baptiſm (which is Scriptureleſs) tho' Mr. *F.* pretends it was received from the Apoſtles. But were it as true, as it is falſe, that the Churches immediately after the Apoſtles baptized Infants, it would be no Ground for us to do ſo, unleſs it had been reveal'd in the ſacred Pages, which contain the unerring, full, and certain Rule of our Faith and Practice.

Let Perſons once lay aſide the Scripture, and fly to Tradition for Refuge, why they are in the open Way to receive and maintain numberleſs Fancies and Abſurdities, with as good Grace and equal Authority as our Opponents can their Practice of Infant-Baptiſm. I have a great deal of Reaſon to queſtion the Truth of what is here alledg'd, *viz.* That *Ireneus* any where ſays, 'the Church

'learn'd

'learn'd from the Apoſtles to baptize Children;' for (amongſt other Things which incline me to think this to be an *Abuſe* of *Ireneus*) the Words ſeem to be taken from a Marginal Note on a certain Sentence [‡ *Qui per eum Renaſcuntur in Deum; Infantes* ---] which goes under *Ireneus* his Name; upon which 'tis obſerved in the Margent by the Commentator, *Apertè confirmans Apoſtolorum traditionem de baptiſmo Infantium parvulorum* * --- If the Caſe be thus, 'tis even as Mr. *Wall* † ſays on the like Occaſion; 'The Author does not ſay that, for 'which he is cited; but he ſays ſomething from whence 'the other does draw it, as a Conſequence; and then 'ſets down that Conſequence, as if it were the Author's 'own Words.' Which Practice is intolerable, either to do ſo, or cite what is done ſo by another. However Mr. *F.* is hereby deſired to cite the Place in *Ireneus* his Works (which are reputed genuine) where theſe Words he mentions, may be found; or elſe lie under the Charge of abuſing *Ireneus* baſely, to countenance his Practice, and to procure a more welcome Entertainment for it, in the Affections of his Readers.

'I have heard (ſays he) ſome of our Opponents aſſert (tho' 'without Book) That Infant Baptiſm is a Relick of Po-'pery, and a novel Practice; but the primitive Fathers, 'who were before Popery in the Practice of it, prove the 'Contrary. *Anſ.* If he means before Popery began to work, 'tis falſe; for the Myſtery of Iniquity began to work in the Apoſtle *Paul*'s Time, 2 *Theſ.* ii. 7. and none can pretend to ſhew any Inſtances of Infants baptized in *Paul*'s Time: But if he means 'twas practiſed before Popery came to its Height, ſo were many other Errors alſo; or elſe how ſhould Popery come to its Height? particularly, giving the Sacrament of the Supper to Infants, and aſſerting it to be neceſſary to their Salvation; as the Rev. Mr. *Dickinſon* teſtifies §

And what a great Step towards the advancing of Pope-

‡ Vid. Iren. adverſ. Hær. lib. 2. cap. 39. pag. 161. Who by him are regenerated unto God; Infants --- * Evidently eſtabliſhing the Tradition of the Apoſtles concerning the Baptiſm of little Infants. † Hiſt of Inf. bap. pag. 259. § Doctrine of Regeneration vind. page 56.

ry in the World, was it to hold, ‖ 'That to ſuffer the 'Infant to die unbaptized, was to endanger its Salva-'tion.' But whether Infant-baptiſm be a Relick of Popery or not, 'tis plain 'tis a Relick of *ſomething* not warranted by the Word of God.

It muſt be always obſerv'd and remembred, that the Rule to which we are directed for trying any Practice, whether it be *novel*, is the Holy Scripture, *Iſa.* viii. 20. *Mat.* xix. 8. *Rom.* iv. 3. And in this Caſe, we ſay with Proteſtants ‡ in other Caſes, *What is in the Word of God* is TRUE and OLD; and ſuch is the Doctrine and Practice of Believers Baptiſm. And *what is not contain'd therein*, is FALSE and NEW *(tho' of many Hundred Years ſtanding)* and ſuch is the Doctrine and Practice of Infant-baptiſm. Hence our calling this Practice *Novel*, is not a mere Clamour, any otherwiſe than ſpeaking the Truth is ſo.

'But let them now go to (ſays he) and ranſack the 'Volumes of Antiquity, and ſee if they can give an 'Account from authentic Hiſtory of our Beginning. If 'they cannot, they are behind hand with us, for we 'can give them a pretty full and authentic Account of 'the Riſe and Progreſs of their Party.' *Reply.* This is pleaſantly ſaid! *The whiteſt Head it ſeems ſhall carry the Cauſe.* I confeſs our Opponents are indeed beforehand with us, in this Point; and there is a great deal of Reaſon for it, becauſe we have not ſuch authentic Hiſtory of their Beginning, as they have of ours. The Records of Holy Scripture abundantly ſupply them, to ſhew when we began; but we have not ſuch Records, to ſhew when they began. But by the beſt Account yet brought to our Hands, from the Volumes of Antiquity, they did not begin to appear in the World, (if Mr. *F.* means by their Beginning, when Infants were firſt baptized) till about the third Century: About which Time the Sacrament of the Supper * was alſo given to Infants; which Practice continued in the Church for many Ages. But if he means by their Beginning, when the *Preſbyterian* Sect began, it wa

‖ Wall's Hiſt. p. 44. ‡ Morning Exerciſe againſt Pop. p. 209. * Vi
Monſr. L'Arroque's Hiſt. of the Euchariſt. p. 327.

was not till the 15th Century. There is therefore all the Reaſon in the World, if Antiquity ſhall turn the Scales, to allow us to be in the Right: For our Doctrine and Practice, That Profeſſing Believers are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm, is the very ſelf-ſame which the Apoſtles taught. And the Scriptural and Apoſtolical Doctrine which always requires Faith and Repentance in Perſons in order to Baptiſm, does from the Beginning virtually and really oppoſe and exclude the contrary Doctrine, which teaches that Perſons may be baptized, who do neither repent nor believe, as in the Caſe of Infants.

Hence our Oppoſing ſuch Kind of Baptiſm as our Opponents plead for, is doing nothing more than what is really contain'd in the Doctrine of Believers Baptiſm it ſelf, ſo plentifully confirm'd in Scripture: And in ſpight of all Oppoſition, our Practice of baptizing Believers only, will always appear perfectly concurrent with all the Scripture Examples of Baptiſm. Since then our Beginning is ſo *good* and *honourable*, I need not be much concern'd at preſent to give any Relation of our *Progreſs*, for Mr. *F.* ſays he can give a *pretty full* and *authentic Account of it*, for us.

But again, it is the moſt inconcluſive and fallacious Way of Reaſoning that can be, which Mr. *F.* uſes here; much like what one Mr. *Whiſton* uſed once, *viz.* 'Becauſe we 'know not the Time when Infant-baptiſm was inſtiuted, 'we may therefore ſay it is from Heaven, and not of 'Men.'

To which Mr. *Hutchinſon* ‡ returns the following Anſwer. 'Now I perceive the Reaſon why he beſtows ſo 'glorious a § Title upon his Book. But ſhall we con-'clude that the Tares the Enemy ſowed, while the 'Watchmen ſlept, were *from Heaven and not of Men*; 'ſince the drouſy Watchmen cannot calculate the Time 'they were ſown to a Minute! Learned *Uſher* gives '*Malone* the Jeſuit an Anſwer to this Purpoſe, when he 'maintain'd that the Maſs was of divine Inſtitution, be-'cauſe Proteſtants could not exactly find out its Nativi-'ty; or when the Fooleries that attend it, had their

‡ Animad. p. 36. § viz. Infant-baptiſm from Heaven, and not from Men.

'Original: *Muſt we receive every Error when we cannot aſſign the critical Minute of its Broaching?* Suppoſe 'I know not the Time when Mr. *Whiſton* was born, ſhall 'I therefore conclude him not to be a Man, *nor of Men*; 'but dropt *from Heaven, &c.* Is it not enough if we 'can tell the Time when Infant-baptiſm was not in the 'Church? and that Mr. *Baxter* has (very kindly) done 'for us, when he ſays, *That it has no expreſs mention in 'the Records, or Hiſtories of the Church, for the firſt (and 'pureſt) Centuries.* And if this be the Ground of his 'Mock-title, I ſhall conclude it to be (like Mr. *Baxter*'s Plain Scripture Proof) of a Complexion that cannot bluſh.'

And thus Mr. *F.* argues; 'If they cannot ſhew any 'Time ſince the Apoſtle's Days, wherein our Practice of 'Infant-baptiſm began, it gives Ground to conclude, 'that it it did not begin ſince their Days.'—Such Kind of Reaſonings are quite inconcluſive, becauſe it is beyond all Doubt there is no Account of Infant-baptiſm in Scripture; it therefore muſt begin ſome Time ſince; and where ſhall we fix its Beginning, but at the Time when we have the firſt mention of it (of any Weight or Credit) in thoſe Volumes of Antiquity; which, as Dr. ‡ *Gale* teſtifies, is from the *Carthaginian* Fathers, about the 3d Century. If Mr. *F.* denies this, he and his Brethren may *go to*, and *ranſack* the Volumes of Antiquity over again (if they think it is worth while to ſpend ſo much of their precious Time about ſupporting a Scriptureleſs Practice) and give us undoubted Inſtances of it if they can, from the Apoſtle's Times down to the Time I mention'd. Alſo Mr. *F.* is oblig'd by his own *Rule* to ſhew us the Year when the Practice of Infants Communion began, and cite us the *Chronological* Table where we may find it, and give us the Names of the Ring-leaders, *&c.* or elſe, according to his Way of Arguing, there will be the ſame Ground to conclude that that Practice (which § St. *Auſtin* calls an Apoſtolical Tradition) did not begin neither ſince the Apoſtle's Days. Indeed to

‡ Letter 13. p. 528. § Lib. of Prophecy. p. 119.

to go about to prove any Thing after this Manner, is moſt abſurd and ridiculous.

As to Mr. *F*'s Suggeſtion that our Opinion began leſs than 300 Years ago, 'tis to be ranked amongſt the reſt of his improper Methods, and ſubtle Artifices, to ſupport his Practice: But with what Face can he ſay or publiſh ſuch a Falſhood to the World, that our Opinion began within the Compaſs of ſuch a Time? when 'tis nothing elſe but what is plainly and undeniably revealed in Holy Scripture, *viz.* That Believers are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm. We may therefore very juſtly ſay with Proteſtants (in other Caſes) that our Opinion is contain'd in Scripture, where Mr. *F*'s Opinion of Infant-baptiſm never was. And can he deny us to be properly the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, who hold the ſame Doctrine as they did, and practiſe accordingly? If he denies this, let him ſhew wherein we deviate from them in this Caſe. On the other Hand, can he imagine that he acts according to the Practice of the Apoſtles in his Baptizing Infants, when he can't ſhew in one Inſtance, that they ever did ſo? In a Word, what I would deſire of him at preſent, is to ſhew that our Opinion is not founded in Scripture; but if he cannot do this, let him then forbear to call that a New Opinion, which is none other but the *Doctrine* of the Lord Jeſus, how contemtuouſly ſoever he is pleas'd to treat it.

Mr. *E.* ſeems very much unacquainted with the Manner how Errors enter into the Church, by his Way of ſpeaking, *viz.* 'Or elſe let them give even probable 'Reaſons how Infant-baptiſm could begin un-notic'd, and 'without any Noiſe or Buſtle?' *Anſ.* If any want to be inform'd how Errors in general begin, or enter into the Church, let him read 2 *Pet.* ii. 1, 2, 3. *Mat.* xiii. 25. with other ſuch like Places of Scripture. Pray what *Noiſe* or *Buſtle* is made when Perſons act *privily* under the Cloak of *feign'd* Words? and if any Noiſe ſhould be made, yet when Men are aſleep, they cannot ſo readily obſerve it: And it ſeems Infant-baptiſm was firſt introduc'd after ſome ſuch Manner, under ſome fair Pretence of its being neceſſary to Salvation, *&c.* but yet not

with ſuch entire Silence neither, as our Opponents ſuggeſt; for *Tertullian* who flouriſhed about the Beginning of the 3d *Century*, and (as Mr. ‡*Symſon* ſays) was a *learned Preacher* in the City of *Carthage* in *Africa*, oppoſed it, as appears by his Words, as Mr. *Wall* renders them, † 'But they whoſe Duty it is to adminiſter Baptiſm, are 'to know, that it muſt not be given raſhly, *Give to* 'every one that aſketh thee, has its proper Subject, and 'relates to Alms giving: But that Command rather is 'here to be conſidered, Give not that which is holy to 'Dogs, neither caſt your Pearls before Swine. And 'that you lay Hands ſuddenly on no Man, neither be 'partaker of every One's Faults.---Therefore according 'to every One's *Condition* and *Diſpoſition*, and alſo their '*Age*, the delaying of Baptiſm is more profitable, eſpe-'cially in the Caſe of *little Children*; for what Need is 'there that the God-fathers (*Sponſores*, Sureties) ſhould 'be brought into Danger? becauſe they may either fail 'of their Promiſes by Death, or they may be miſtaken 'by a Child's proving of wicked Diſpoſition. Our 'Lord ſays indeed, *Do not forbid them to come to me*: 'Therefore let them come when they are grown up; 'let them come when they underſtand; when they are 'inſtructed whither it is that they come; let them be 'made Chriſtians when they can know Chriſt. What 'need their guiltleſs Age make ſuch haſte to the For-'giveneſs of Sins? Men will proceed more warily in 'worldly Things: And he that ſhould not have earthly 'Goods committed to him, yet ſhall have heavenly.§ Let 'them know how to deſire this Salvation, that you may 'appear to have given to one that aſketh.' This Paſſage (with others) ſhew that *Tertullian* was againſt Infant-baptiſm; and Dr. *Gale* has refuted Mr. *Wall's* Arguments for the Contrary. Mr. *F.* may be pleaſed to read again, and he'll find Infant baptiſm was oppoſed before the Time of *Auxentius* the *Arrian*, in the fourth Century.

'Let

‡ Hiſt. of the Church. † Wall's Hiſt. p. 21.

§ Cautius agetur in ſecularibus; ut cui ſubſtantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Men act more cautiouſly in ſecular Affairs, than to commit divine Things to ſuch as would not be intruſted with earthly Subſtance.

'Let them but ſhew us (ſays Mr. *F.*) how it conſiſts 'with God's Promiſes to his People, that the Generality 'of the moſt eminent Chriſtians, the wiſeſt, moſt 'learned, moſt inquiſitive, and moſt holy *Divines*, 'ſhould be left to live and die out of the Church, after 'all poſſible Diligence to diſcover the Truth in this 'Point?' *Anſ.* Here is a Bundle of great Titles to amuſe the World with! We are not to follow *Paul* any further than he followed Chriſt. If the *Bereans* ſearched the Scripture daily, to know whether the Things ſpoken by *Paul* were ſo, and were commended for their ſo doing, *Acts* xvii. 11. is it then any Diſparagement to thoſe moſt learned, and moſt holy Divines, that we ſhould alſo examine what they ſay by the Teſtimony of Scripture, to ſee whether Infant-baptiſm be the Truth of God or no? and when we can't find it revealed there, nor they don't direct us where it may be found, let Mr. *F.* tell us which is beſt and ſafeſt for us to follow, thoſe great Men (whom on other Accounts we do highly eſteem) or the unerring and infallible Word of God, and the *ſhining* Example of the primitive Chriſtians, the *more wiſe*, *more learned*, *and more* holy Apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt (who were infallible) in this Caſe; and who do unitedly confirm our Doctrine to be juſt and true. Or is Mr. *F.* angry with us, becauſe we don't take what thoſe *great* Men ſay upon truſt, and believe Infant-baptiſm to be right, without any Trial, becauſe they ſay ſo---How then ſhould we eſcape his Cenſure elſewhere * *viz.* 'That many People 'are ſo ſtupid and ſlothful, as never to ſearch for Truth, 'nor ſeek to ſee with their own Eyes, in Matters of Religion.' Seeing Mr. *F.* allows us Liberty to uſe our own Eyes, in Matters of Religion, ſhall not we have Liberty alſo to act in religious Matters, according to what we ſee without Blame, or being called ‡ *Schiſmaticks* and *Bigots?* Otherwiſe of what Uſe is it, for us to ſee with our own Eyes (unleſs it be to increaſe *Stupidity* and *Sloth* to the utmoſt) if our Conſciences muſt notwithſtanding *truckle* on under the Influence of the *Reverend Crowd*, contrary to Light received? What would this be, but like

* Preface, p. 8. ‡ Charit. Plea. p. 114.

like an Aſs couching down between two Burthens; or like a *Preſbyterian*, who is convinc'd by Scripture that his Infant Sprinkling is wrong, but dares not forſake it, becauſe of the *Firebrands* and *Death* caſt in his Way ‡. Mr. *F*'s Queſtion in this laſt cited Paragraph, is eaſily reſolved, by obſerving, *That particular Churches may be more or leſs pure, according as the Doctrine of the Goſpel is taught and embraced,* ORDINANCES *adminiſtred, and publick Worſhip performed more or leſs purely in them.* So that our Rejecting Infant-baptiſm, as a Corruption of the ſacred Ordinance of Jeſus Chriſt, does not afford Mr. *F.* theſe Abſurdities he would throw upon us; but only beſpeaks, that we believe the Communities of our Oppoñents to be far leſs pure and unlike the Apoſtolic Churches, than our own; which none can *juſtly* blame us for, 'till they *rationally* convince us of the Contrary.

'And let them ſay whether the Body of ſuch Chriſti-'ans and Miniſters, with the wiſe Reformers and cou-'rageous Martyrs, be not on our Side of the Queſtion.' *Anſ.* If Truth was to be decided by Votes, there might be ſome Weight in this Argument; but ſeeing it is not, this is of no great Uſe in the preſent Controverſy; but ſuch as it is, we can't fully allow it them neither; becauſe there have been, and are Thouſands of Chriſtians who reject their Infant-baptiſm as inſipid and Scriptureleſs. And ſeeing we are upon it, I may juſt ſhew them that we are before them in this Caſe: Let them give us any Inſtances of Martyrs who ſuffered Death upon the Account of Infant-baptiſm; as we can ſhew many Inſtances of Godly Men, who ſuffered even unto Death for denying it. They may ſhew that Pœdobaptiſts ſuffered Martyrdom; but none ſuffered for holding Infant-baptiſm; or this was no Cauſe of their ſuffering. Mr. *Rees* § cites Inſtances of many who ſuffered even to Death for denying Infant-baptiſm, and profeſſing the Contrary, out of *Gerrard Brandt*'s Hiſtory of the Reformation; whom he calls, *that faithful Dutch Hiſtorian.* The Hiſtorian ſays, 'The Reformation, exclu-'ſive

‡ Vid. Divine Right of Inf. Bapt. p. 6, 7, 28. § Inf. Baptiſm no Inſtitution of Chriſt. p. 181

'ſive of Infant-baptiſm, was ſet on Foot in *Switzerland*, 'about the Year 1522, by the Zeal of *Conrad Grebel* 'and *Fœlix Mans*, *both* Men of *Learning*, who fell out 'with *Zuinglius* about the ſaid Opinion. But we are 'told that this *Falling-out* coſt them very dear; for the 'Hiſtorian informs us in the next Paragraph, that upon 'Account of this Difference, was the firſt *Edict* againſt '*Anabaptiſts* publiſhed at *Zurich*; in which there was a 'Penalty of a *Silver Mark*, or two *Guilders Dutch* Mo-'ney, ſet upon all ſuch as ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be 're-baptized, or ſhould with-hold Baptiſm from their 'Children. And it was further declared, that thoſe 'who openly oppoſed this *Order*, ſhould be yet more ſe-'verely treated. Accordingly the ſaid *Fœlix* was 'drown'd at *Zurich*, upon the Sentence pronounc'd by '*Zuinglius* in theſe four Words, *Qui iterum Mergit*, '*Mergatur*; that is, He that re-baptizes with Water, 'let him be drowned in the Water. This happen'd in 'the Year 1526; but about the ſame Time, and ſince, 'there were more of them put to Death: A *Procedure* 'that appeared *very ſtrange* to ſome.' Upon which Mr. *Rees* juſtly obſerves,-----

'Strange indeed! and very melancholy Times! 'That a *Proteſtant*, and a *Miniſter* too, ſhould pro-'nounce a *barbarous* and *inhuman* Sentence upon his *Bro-'ther*, for diſputing againſt *Infant-baptiſm*: A Thing 'which at beſt, has but ſome dark *Tradition* to ſupport 'it; for there is not one *ſingle Text* in the *whole Bible*, 'that will plainly warrant it, and many Pœdo-baptiſts 'confeſs ſo much.'

Again, ‡ 'I have carefully told over Five Hundred 'and Seventy odd Perſons (all Anabaptiſts) who were 'put to Death merely on Account of Religion, exclu-'ſive of, and in Contradiſtinction to any who ſuffered, 'as chargeable with *Treaſon*, *Rebellion*, *Sedition*, &c. 'Nor have I reckon'd into the Number, a *whole Aſſem-'bly* of *theſe* People which was betrayed at *Rotterdam* in 'the Year 1544, for I could not make an Eſtimate of 'them; but all that were caught of theſe, were executed.

'Upon

‡ Ibid. Page 229

'Upon a fair Computation then, this Scantling of *Ana-*
'*baptiſts*, who ſuffered abroad, in and about the *Low*
'*Countries*, for their Religious Principles, amounts con-
'ſiderably to above the higheſt Number of thoſe, of
'whatſoever Denominations, who were put to Death in
'*England*, on Account of the Reformation. What I
'further obſerve, is, That in the Judgment of *Chriſtian*
'*Charity*, there appeared in theſe, not only equal Firm-
'neſs of Mind, and the Traces of a good Spirit, but they
'had ſuch divine Tranſports, and ſolid Aſſurances be-
'fore their *Exits*, as eminently attended our *glorious*
'*Britiſh Martyrs*.' Hence it appears, how vain and empty Mr. *F*'s Pretence is, as well as how falſe is *that* which follows, *viz.* 'On the other Hand, 'tis too well
'known, that the Anabaptiſts were the *Dregs* and Re-
'proach of the Reformation in *Germany*, where they
'began, and in every Place where they then got Footing.'
Anſ. If all other Arguments and Methods fail our Opponents, then it is but to have Recourſe to the Anabaptiſts in *Germany*, *&c.* that if by any Means the Truth which we profeſs, might be brought ſome way under Contempt, and its Profeſſors repreſented to be the real (tho' baſe) *Progeny* of two or three ſcandalous Men in *Germany*. But it ſeems our Opponents can never diſtinguiſh between the Truth, and thoſe who profeſs to hold it. Did thoſe few Anabaptiſts (thus deſcrib'd) hold and maintain Believers to be the (only) proper Subjects of Baptiſm? Why then they held what was contain'd in Scripture long enough before they were born: And is the Truth of God, and the Doctrine of Chriſt the worſe, becauſe ſuch Men pretended to believe it? Were the Doctrines of the Goſpel the Worſe, becauſe there was a *Judas* among the Apoſtles? Does not Mr. *F.* know it is one of the Devices of Satan to bring Truth under Contempt, by corrupting its Profeſſors? And why will our Opponents make uſe of thoſe Corruptions, as Arguments againſt the Truth itſelf? In a Word, what Improvement ſoever our Opponents may think proper to make of the *Corruptions* or *Irregularities* of any Men, who at any Time, profeſs'd Believers to be the proper Subjects of Baptiſm, they may

hear

hear it once more told them, that this is a Truth which *ſhines* with unbeclouded Brightneſs throughout the whole New Teſtament, far above their mean Arts and Devices ever to eclipſe or ſubvert whilſt the Earth remaineth.

After Mr. *F.* has labour'd to wound the Character of his Opponents, with what he thought proper, then he would fain ſooth them up again, with his *Compliments*; of his *ſincere Regard*, and *high Eſteem* of Numbers of them, *&c.* probably we ſhould think his *Regard* quite as ſincere, and his Eſteem every way as high, if he had not mention'd a Word of all this, as now we do, after all his free (perhaps forc'd) Confeſſion of it; unleſs there were greater Evidences to be found in his Writings, of his Regard and Eſteem, than appear to be.

Further, Mr. *F.* makes an Apology for his Expreſſions: *If he has uſed any that may ſeem too keen and ſevere, he aſſures us ſuch Turns proceed not from bitterneſs of Spirit, but his natural Diſpoſition in Diſputation, and a Studiouſneſs of ſetting the Argument in a ſtrong Light.* We have only his bare Word to the contrary (and that is no good Proof in his own Caſe) but what Bitterneſs of Spirit is his natural Diſpoſition in Diſputation, and is all the Steel that ſets any Edge and *Keenneſs* upon his otherwiſe *blunt* Weapons in the preſent Engagement. But if he was conſcious to himſelf, of his having uſed keen Expreſſions, which were like to Prejudice his Opponents, methinks it would have been prudent for him to ſoften them, or elſe omitted this *uſeleſs* Apology.

Having gone through with what he thought proper to obſerve, he comes now to his Concluſion, and tells us, 'Tho' I do not eſteem the denying Baptiſm to Infants a 'damnable Error, nor the Contrary a Foundation 'Truth, yet I cannot but eſteem it a Truth of ſuch Im-'portance, as is worthy to be contended for.' *Anſ.* 'Tis but three or four Years ago, that there was a mighty Noiſe of Perſons being *carnal* if they *contended* about thoſe outward Things.

But it ſeems the Times are changed, and our Opponents are changed in them. We always look'd upon the Doctrine of Believers Baptiſm to be an *Important Truth*,

and

and have therefore in proper Times and Places contended for it, againſt the Abuſe and Corruptions of our Opponents. Mr. *F.* ſays, *What greatens our Error, is our denying* Abraham's *Covenant to have been the Covenant of Grace. Anſ.* We do ſtill flatly deny the Covenant of Grace to be made with *Abraham* on BEHALF of himſelf, and ALL HIS SEED, *&c.* and continue to ſay the Covenant of Grace was made with Chriſt only, as a publick Perſon, *and in him with all the Elect as his Seed.*

And further, that the Covenant of Grace was *reveal'd* to *Adam* ſoon after he fell, and ſo down to *Abraham*, *David*, *&c.* under the former legal, typical, and dark Diſpenſation, till Chriſt came in the Fleſh, with whom the Covenant was made, who built his New Teſtament viſible Church of *Believing Jews* and *Gentiles*, and none elſe that we can find: And hereby we preſerve the Harmony and Connection between the Old and New Teſtament entire, notwithſtanding Mr. *F*s falſe and ſlanderous Inſinuation to the Contrary. In the mean Time, I put him upon the Proof to cite one ſingle Paſſage of the Old Teſtament that we repeal, which God has not repeal'd: And if he cannot do this, as I know he cannot, let him recal his falſe Aſſertion, and take heed for the future, what Charges he brings againſt us.

Again, if *we do diminiſh from the Word of God*, as Mr. *F.* ſuggeſts, 'tis very unaccountable how he could in a Page or two before expreſs his *Gladneſs*, becauſe of our Agreement with him in the *great Eſſentials* of Religion. What? an Agreement with ſuch People as he repreſents us to be? Does he reckon the *Eſſentials* of Religion to be entire, tho' a *very great Part* of God's Word be repeal'd, which he hath not repeal'd? Strange Religion! Strange Agreement! or elſe a very ſtrange and falſe Repreſentation of his Brethren!

I wiſh Mr. *F.* could expreſs his Love and Regard to us more conſiſtent with himſelf. If we agree with him in the *Eſſentials* of Religion, then we do not repeal a *very great Part* of God's Word, which he has not repealed, and thereby diminiſh from it, unleſs he does ſo. Neither can this Charge be ever proven againſt us, unleſs Mr. *F.* will

will acknowledge that he has told a positive Untruth in Print; or else say that he can agree in *Essentials* with those, who diminish from the Word of God; which if he does, we will at the first Notice profess our *Dissent* from him in this Case.

Says he, 'They account Believers Infants Common 'and Unclean, as the Infants of *Turks* and *Pagans*.' *Ans.* The Reverse of this is of mighty Force to *win* upon People who are generally and naturally *fond* of their Children, and ready enough to think their own *Geese*, *Swans*. The Carnal *Jews* of old, were puff'd up with the *Notion* of their being the Seed of *Abraham*, *John* viii. 33, 37, 39. And these are the Steps our Opponents would lead their People in, to think that their Infant Seed are some how better than others. But the Scriptures assure us, there is no *real* Difference betwixt the Seed of Believers, and Unbelievers, *Rom.* iii. 9. *Eph.* ii. 3. And as to any other Difference, of *Ceremonial*, *Typical*, or *Fœderal* Holiness, the New Testament Dispensation acknowledges none; and 'tis but begging the Question, to say, that God *accounts them holy*. 'They deny (says he) that any 'Infants visibly belong to God, by casting them out of 'his Church, and denying them to have any Part in his 'Covenant, and so do consign them over to *Satan*.' *Ans.* What a strange Heap of Stuff is here thrown up together; if by any Means we may be painted black, and deformed to the Eyes of the World? But, 1. Where has Mr. *F.* shewn that Believers Infants were ever in the New Testament Church? 'Tis idle Talk to say that we cast them out of the Church, when none has shewn, and I presume, never can shew, that they were in it.

2. Our Opponents do own there is no actual being in the Covenant of Grace, but by *Election* on God's Part, and Faith on Man's Part §: And we deny Infants to have any Part in the Covenant of Grace, no otherwise than as they have not *consented* to the *Order* of the Gospel, in an unreserved saving Closure with Jesus Christ, whereby Persons are *actually* and *visibly* interested in the Covenant of Grace.

3. We

§ Consideration of the Queriſts. p. 32.

3. We do not *conſign* Infants over to Satan, any other-ways than declaring what the Scripture ſays of them, *viz.* That they are all under Sin, and by Nature Children of Wrath; ignorant of God; ‡ deſtitute of original Righteouſneſs; having their Nature wholly corrupted, whereby they are utterly indiſpos'd, diſabled, and become oppoſite unto all that is ſpiritually good; and wholly inclin'd to all Evil. And for Mr. *F.* to take ſuch and adminiſter Baptiſm to them, is to have under his Hands a viſible improper Subject of this Goſpel Ordinance. Further Mr. *F.* ſays, 'Out of the Covenant there is no Salvation.' We underſtand he means the Covenant (made with *Abraham)* which he ſo often mentions, of which Circumciſion was a Token: If ſo, it is falſe; for Godly Perſons were ſaved, tho' they were not in *Abraham*'s Covenant, as I have ſhewn already; or elſe what became of righteous *Lot*, and others? What is Mr. *F.* driving at here, but to ſet forth a *new Edition* of the old Story, *viz.* Out of the Church there is no Salvation. Beſides what a Limiting of the Holy One of *Iſrael* is here? according to him, the Children of Non-members are out of the Covenant (without the Pales of the viſible Church) and therefore if they die in their Infancy they *cannot* be ſaved. His *Performance* indeed bears the *fair* and *promiſing* Title of a *Charitable Plea* for the *Speechleſs*; but is there no Charity, for the poor little Speechleſs Ones of Non-members, dying in their Infancy? No, according to Mr. *F.* for they are out of *Abraham*'s Covenant, and therefore excluded from Salvation. Hard Caſe! Yea, truly hard! That the Sin of their *Parents* in Neglecting to join themſelves to the Church, ſhould put their Infant Seed ſo far off, that the ſaving Benefits of Chriſt's Blood *cannot* reach them. This is the *Gentleman* that is pleas'd to charge us with Conſigning Infants over to the Devil. Let all Men judge betwixt us, whether our Opponents or we are guilty of the greateſt *Uncharitableneſs* and *Cruelty*, reſpecting Children. They who (according to this Aſſertion) deny the Poſſibility of Salvation to the Infants of Non-members (dying in their Infancy)

‡ See Aſſembly's Larger Catechiſm.

Infancy) or we who only deny to adminiſter Baptiſm to the Infants of Church-members, becauſe God hath not commanded it.

'Yea (ſays Mr. *F.*) they lay dangerous *Grounds* to 'derogate from Chriſt himſelf, when he was an Infant; 'for tho' he was Head of the Church, yet according to 'their Principles, they muſt have deny'd him Member-'ſhip in it, until he was grown up; and what Abſur-'dity is greater, than to deny the Maſter of the Houſe 'a Right to be in it?' *Anſ.* All this is calculated for the Meridian of Falſhood. Our Opponents write as if they thought their Pens ſanctified the moſt palpable *Untruths* in the World. What Grounds do we lay that have any ſuch Tendency, as this Heap of *Calumny* ſuggeſts? Mr. *F.* ſays, Baptiſm was not a divine Inſtitution, when Chriſt was born; and did we (according to our Principles) ever gainſay in the leaſt that the Male Infants of *Abraham* had a Right to Circumciſion? Let Mr. *F.* mention any of theſe *dangerous Grounds*, if he can; or elſe retract this baſe and ſlanderous Aſſertion. Seeing Baptiſm was not inſtituted when Chriſt was born, how is it poſſible that our Denying Infant-baptiſm, ſhould affect the Caſe of Chriſt, before the Ordinance of Baptiſm was inſtituted? There is no Colour of Reaſon to ſupport this Inſinuation, not at all.

'They are moreover (ſays he) driven, in Defence 'of their Principles, to wreſt many precious Scriptures, 'and put uncouth and unreaſonable Gloſſes upon them, 'to ſuit their Judgment.' This I deny. And 'tis no Ways probable it ſhould be true; when the Doctrine of Baptiſm, which we contend for and maintain, is ſupported by all thoſe Places which ſpeak of the Ordinance; and that of Baptizing Infants hath not one ſingle Command, Example, or Inſtance, to ſupport it, in the whole Scripture. Let all Men *judge*, if there is any Probability we ſhould be *neceſſitated* to *wreſt* Scriptures in Defence of our Principles, which are no other than that Believers are the proper Subjects of Baptiſm. And further, let them *judge* alſo, whether it is not probable, that our Opponents are *forc'd* to wreſt Scripture in De-

fence

ſence of Infant-baptiſm, when there are no Inſtances of it in the Word of God?

We come now to the *Cloſe* of Mr. *Finley's* firſt Part of his *Performance*, where he concludes, hoping what is *ſaid* may ſuffice, as to the SUBJECTS of *Baptiſm*. If thro' the whole he had brought any *Command* or *Example* for Infant-baptiſm, much leſs *Writing* would have been *ſufficient*; but ſeeing he has not, he is deſired to obſerve, that were he to ſay as *much more*, and *double* to *that*, it would be all *inſufficient* to warrant the Practice of *Baptizing Infants*, or prove it to be the *Inſtitution* of our LORD and exalted *Saviour* JESUS CHRIST.

THE

THE MODE of BAPTISM BY IMMERSION VINDICATED.

LET us now proceed to wait on Mr. *Finley* in what he hath to ſay about the *Mode* of Baptiſm.

His *Second* general Aſſertion is, 'That Baptiſm is *rightly* adminiſtred by ſprinkling or 'pouring Water on the Perſon baptized.'

The firſt *Particular*, which is improved by him in Vindication of this Aſſertion, is as follows, 'There is 'nothing in the Word of God contradictory to it; or, 'in other Words, that the Anabaptiſts Arguments a-'gainſt it, do not overthrow it.

It ſeems Mr. *F.* cannot bear to think *our very ſmall Community* (as he is pleas'd to call it) to be in the *Right*, reſpecting the *Mode* of Baptiſm. Certainly he might have known by divers Inſtances, that *ſmall* Communities have had the *Truth* on their Side before now, when the *Crowds* and Multitude, embraced Error. To a conſiderate judicious Perſon (methinks) there appears the greater Probability we are in the *Right*; when our *ſmall Community* ſhould be able to *ſtem* the ſtrong *Current* of gene-

ral Reproaches, Scoffings, and whatever other *Sluices* Men have thought proper to open againſt us, to make the ſwelling Stream more violent and rapid. Can any one think why we ſhould differ from the Multitude in our *Practice*, but becauſe our *Conſciences* are influenc'd with the plain Declarations of God's Will, and Scripture Examples, in this Caſe. However, till we ſee otherwiſe, we think it better to be of the Number of this *ſmall Community*, and have *Truth* at our Side, than to dwell in a *large Houſe* with *ill-natur'd Error* in our Arms.

And why ſhould Mr. *F.* be ſo much diſpleas'd with our Practice? If it be the *Truth* which we hold, and if it is by practiſing *it*, *we unchurch all the Proteſtant World*, he can do no leſs (methinks) than acknowledge, there is no Matter how ſoon the *Proteſtant* World is unchurch'd, that they may be church'd according to *Truth* and *Goſpel-Order*. But if we are in an Error in this Point (as he ſuggeſts) 'tis not poſſible that we ſhould unchurch the *Proteſtant* World, unleſs they unchurch themſelves by embracing our Principles. Let Mr. *F.* take it which Way he will, the mighty Blow he intended to give us, very happily *ſlips* by, without doing any Execution.

He ſums up what (as he ſays) we advance in favour of *Dipping*, under three Heads, *viz.* 1. The Etymology of the Word Baptiſm. 2. Scripture Examples. 3. Scripture Alluſions. All theſe Particulars afford us good Arguments for what we practiſe, as may appear in proper Place.

'Now (ſays he) if we can prove that *Baptizo* does any 'where ſignify to pour or ſprinkle, then we raze the 'very Foundation of the *Anabaptiſts* Argument: For 'what can be plainer? if *Baptizo* does at all ſignify to 'pour or ſprinkle, then it does not only and always ſig-'nify Dipping, and conſequently our Opponents can get 'no certain and infallible Argument from the *Meaning* 'of the Word.' *Anſ.* 'Tis a very bad Weapon to go to War with, which will certainly deſtroy him that handles it inſtead of the Enemy. Unleſs Mr. *F.* could make appear that *Baptizo* always ſignifies to pour or ſprinkle,

ſprinkle, we ſhall *raze* the very Foundation of his Argument (or Principle) too; which is, That Baptiſm is *rightly* adminiſtred by Pouring or Sprinkling; for let him once grant (as he does here) that *Baptizo* does ſometimes ſignify to dip, he can get no certain and infallible Argument from the Meaning of the Word in Favour of his *Opinion* and *Practice*. So that upon the very firſt *Onſet*, we ſtand upon a *Par* with him in this Point; and conſequently our Mode muſt be right, according to his own Way of Reaſoning; How then could he give himſelf the Liberty to ridicule it in the following *Pages*, in the Manner he has done? But when we come to the *Puſh*, Mr. *F.* fails in the *Undertaking*; for he has not cited us one Inſtance from *Lexico-graphers*, where the Word is rendred by *perfundo*, *aſpergo*, to pour or ſprinkle, not at all; but labours to ſupply his wide Defect with his Aſſertion, that *Pouring* or *Sprinkling* are as *really* Modes of Waſhing, as Dipping or Plunging; then his Conſequence muſt be, Therefore *Baptizo* ſignifies to pour or ſprinkle; which is very weak and falſe: For had the Word carry'd ſuch a Meaning in it, thoſe approv'd *Maſters* of the *Greek* Tongue, which Mr. *F.* mentions, would have render'd it ſo. He can't but know that there is a great Difference between the proper Signification of a Word, and a *forc'd* Conſequence. Will Mr. *F.* pretend to perſuade the World, that Words have no proper determinate Ideas affix'd to them? I can't help thinking, the Reaſon why he would have the Meaning of this Word to be ſo *uncertain*, is, that he might crowd in ſome *Pretence* for his Practice: But his *Device* will not help him, becauſe the Word is never render'd to pour or ſprinkle; as the *learned* * *Dr. Gale* informs us:

'I have carefully obſerved it (*i. e.* the Word *Baptize*) 'a conſiderable Time, as it occur'd in Reading, and aſ-'ſure you I never found it *once* us'd to ſignify to pour or 'ſprinkle, or any Thing leſs than Dipping; and I may 'challenge any Man to ſhew a ſingle Inſtance of it, ex-'cept in ſome *Eccleſiaſtical* Writers of the latter *corrupt* 'Times, who retaining the Words of the Inſtitution,

* Letter 3d. Page 94.

'and altering the *Thing*, do in this Caſe indeed, but no 'other, extend the Word into a wider Senſe; but Pro. 'phane Authors, who lay under no ſuch *Byes*, have 'made no ſuch Alteration. 'Tis evident from them, 'the primary Meaning is ſimply to *dip*, not only into 'Water, but any Matter.'

'Tis a very improper, and indeed a falſe Way to ſeek for the Senſe and Meaning of the Word *Baptizo*, from the Uſe, or rather Abuſe of it, in corrupt Times. It may be juſt obſerv'd, what an unwarrantable Length Dr. *Featley* (who is quoted by Mr. *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra*) had got to, in his Warmth againſt the Anabaptiſts; when he affirms (which is alſo taken up by Mr. *F.* as one of his Authorities) that *Baptizo* imports no more than Ablution or Waſhing, which may be done without dipping. Which Aſſertion, as it is not true in itſelf, ſo neither does it agree with what is acknowledged in the *Critica Sacra* juſt before, *viz.* 'That *Baptizo* is derived from '*Bapto*, *tingo*, to *dip* or *plunge* into the Water, and ſignifi-'eth *primarily* ſuch a Kind of Waſhing as is uſed in '*Bucks*, where *Linnen* is *plung'd* and *dip'd*.' It was therefore very uſeleſs for Mr. *F.* to repeat this *Idle Story* over again, That *Baptizo* imports no more than *Ablution*, or *Waſhing*; when it is confeſs'd that it ſignifies *primarily* ſuch a Kind of Waſhing, as is by *Dipping* or *Plunging*; eſpecially conſidering what is further ſaid by Mr. *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra*, ſo pertinent and full to our Purpoſe, *viz.* 'That the *native* and *proper* Signification of it (*i. e.* '*Baptizo*) is *to dip into* Water, or to *plunge* under Wa-'ter, *John* iii. 22, 23. *Mat.* iii. 16. *Acts* viii. 38.' This further ſerves to quit us of the Taſk Mr. *F.* would lay upon us, *viz. to ſhew that the Word never ſignifies any other Thing but Dipping or Plunging*: No, nothing elſe, *nativelv* and *properly*. The Obſervations of the Rev. and Learned Mr. *Gill* * deſerve Place here, 'How we are 'like to come off with the Word *Baptizo*; and here 'our *Author* in *p.* 41. tells us, *ore rotundo*, and with Confidence enough in ſo many Words, *that it never* '*does ſignify Plunging*; *Waſhing with Water*, *by Pouring* '*or Sprinkling*, *is the only Meaning of it*. The Man has

* Antient Mode of Baptizing, p. 62.

'got

got a good Aſſurance; but yet by his Writing, he does not ſeem to have ſuch a Stock of Learning; however, what he wants in one, he makes up in the other. 'Tis ſtrange that all our *Lexico-graphers*, ſo many learned Criſticks, and good Divines, ſhould be ſo much miſtaken, as to render the Word, to *dip* or *plunge*, and allow this to be the *proper Signification* of it. I have my ſelf conſulted ſeveral Lexicons, as thoſe of *Suidas*, *Scapula*, *Hadrian*, *Junius*, *Paſor*, as alſo another made by *Budæus*, *Tuſanus*, *Geſner*, *Junius*, *Conſtantine*, *Hartung*, *Hopper* and *Xylander*, who all unanimouſly render the Word by *Mergo*, *immergo*, to *plunge* or *dip into*: And tho' they afterwards add alſo, *Abluo*, *lavo*, to *waſh*, yet 'tis plain they mean ſuch a Waſhing, as is by Dipping; and we are very willing to grant it; for we know that there can be no Dipping, without Waſhing: But had they meant a Waſhing by Pouring or Sprinkling, they would have rendered it by *perfundo*, or *aſpergo*, to *pour upon*, or *ſprinkle*; but this they never do. And, to theſe I might add a large Number of learned Criticks, and good Divines, who grant, that the Word in its firſt and primary Senſe, ſignifies to *dip* or *plunge* only, and to *waſh* only in a ſecondary, remote, and conſequential One; as [*a*] *Caſaubon*, *Camerarius*, *Grotius* [*b*] *Calvin* [*c*] *Alting* [*d*] *Alſted* [*e*] *Wendelin*, and others---But what need I heap up Authors to prove that which no Man of any tolerable Learning will deny: But what will not Ignorance, attended with a conſiderable Share of Confidence, carry a Man thro'?'

The Reverend Aſſembly of Divines, ſays the worthy Mr. *Rees* * 'Tho' they have warily defin'd Baptiſm in general, to be *Waſhing with Water*, in the Catechiſm, yet they don't ſcruple to acknowledge that that Waſhing was by Dipping in the primitive Times. This is evident to any one who will peruſe their Annotations.' And ſo it is in their own Words (on *Matt.* iii. 6. were

 bap-

[*a*] All three on Mat. iii. 6. [*b*] Inſtitut. L. 4. C. 15. Sect. 19. [*c*] Loc. Commun. p. 198, and Explic. Catech. p. 311, [*d*] Lexic. Theolog. p. 121, 222. [*e*] Chriſt. Theolog. L. 1, C. 22. * Animad. on a Diſcourſe of Inf. Bapt. p. 262.

baptized) they ſay, 'Waſhed, by Dipping in *Jordan*.' And if (when they were oblig'd by ſolemn Vow before God, as Mr. *F.* ſignifies, to declare ſincerely their Judgments) they did explain Baptiſm to be *Waſhing with Water*; there is no Reaſon to queſtion but they did under the like Obligation, and with the ſame Sincerity declare, that this Waſhing was by Dipping in the primitive Times, as in the Inſtance before me, which is full to our Purpoſe; for our Enquiry is not what they believed might do in their Time, but what they ſay of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm in the primitive Times, which they allow was by Dipping; certainly the Practice of *John* in Dipping the Multitudes in *Jordan*, is good Argument in our Favour. It likewiſe appears, the Aſſembly of Divines underſtood the Word *Baptizo*, ſignifies Dipping; or elſe how ſhould they ſay of thoſe who were baptized by *John*, that they were *waſhed by Dipping in Jordan?* Hence it appears their *Authority* does Mr. *F*'s Cauſe no great Service.

What Mr. *F.* quotes from that very worthy Divine Dr. *Owen*, he (after his uſual Manner) does not tell us from what Part of the Reverend Doctor's Works he takes his Citations; (a Fault all through his Performance, which he is deſired to amend when he writes again) But by what Information I can get, they are taken out of his *poſthumous* Works; which brings to my Mind a certain Paſſage Mr. *Wall* ‡ has to this Purpoſe: 'I know 'ſays he) that many learned Men have ſuffered *much* 'in their Memory, by having all their Letters and *poſthumous* Pieces *printed* after their Death; ſome whereof 'were ſuch, as being written in their Youth, they themſelves would have been aſhamed of afterwards; and would 'upon better Information and Reading, have recanted.

Very agreeable herewith, are the Words of Mr. *Rees*; § 'I am of Opinion, that if his Friends had ſtudied how to 'make him (*i. e.* Dr. *Owen*) *look little*, they could not have 'found a more effectual Way, than by publiſhing theſe '*Remarks* upon *Dipping*; for either what is advanc'd in 'them cannot be made good, or muſt appear to be a fair 'Conceſſion

‡ Hiſt. of Inf. Bapt. pag. 274. § Animad. pag. 264.

'Conceſſion of all that the *Baptiſts* can wiſh for, or 'want, *viz.* That the original Signification of the Word '*Baptizo*, imports to dip. And concluding, That no 'honeſt Man who underſtands the Greek Tongue, can 'deny the Word to ſignify to waſh as well as to *dip*.

'I never met with a *Baptiſt*, who underſtood any 'Thing of the Matter, that ever deny'd this. It does 'ſignify to waſh, but 'tis by *Conſequence*; and 'tis im-'poſſible to dip in fair Water without waſhing. It ne-'ceſſarily implies and comprehends that, in the Nature 'of the Action, when 'tis perform'd in Water; but it 'never ſignifies to waſh *ſimply*, without having Regard 'to *dipping*: Nay it ſignifies to dip into any Matter '*abſolutely*, without regarding Water, or any *other* '*Liquid*. † And the Reverend Dr. *Owen* has not offered 'to aſſert, that the Word in its native Signification im-'ports to *ſprinkle* or *pour*. Had he found any good Au-'thors, who render *Baptizo* by *aſpergo*, *affundo*, or '*perfundo*, this would have been ſomewhat to the Pur-'poſe. Coming ſhort of this, is doing of nothing; for 'this is what the *Pædo-baptiſts* muſt prove, to juſtify 'their own Practice, or elſe what they call Baptiſm, is 'not perform'd according to the genuine Signification of 'the Word *Baptizo*, themſelves being Judges.'

Mr. *F.* proceeds to obſerve the Uſe of the Word in the New Teſtament, and cites *Mark* vii. 4. *And when they come from the Market, except they waſh, they eat not.* 'In the Greek *ean me baptiſontai*, except *they be bap-'tized*.---It is here plain that Baptiſm in Verſe 4. is de-'ſign'd to expreſs the ſame as *Nipſontai* in Verſe 3; 'which laſt none denies to ſignify *Waſhing*.

In Anſwer to which, take what *Beza* obſerves upon this Text; '*Baptizesthai*, in this Place, is more than '*Cherniptein*; for the former ſeems to reſpect the whole 'Body, the latter only the Hands. Nor does *Baptizein* ſig-'nify to *waſh*, but only by *Conſequence*; for it properly 'denotes to *immerſe* for the ſake of *Dipping*.' Hence it appears, Mr. *F*'s Concluſion is very falſe and unjuſt, which he infers from this Text, *viz.* That to baptize a

† Vid. Dr. *Gale*. Letter 3d.

Part of the Body, is true Scripture Baptiſm, according to the Meaning of the Word Baptize: For the Text does not ſay that the *Jews* were baptized when their Hands were waſhed; or the *waſhing of Hands* is not here called *baptizing* them: But when their whole Body was waſhed (as *Beza* obſerves) agreeable to the Signification of the Word (*Baptiſontai*) here uſed, which as Mr. *Leigh* teſtifies, 'Implieth the *Waſhing* of their *whole Body*.'

'Tis not improper to add what Mr. *Gill* † ſays on theſe Words, *And when they come from the Market, except they waſh, they eat not*, 'which may be underſtood either
'1. Of the Things they bought in the Market, which 'they did not eat, until they were waſhed. Thus the 'Syriac Verſion reads the Words; and what they buy 'in the Market, unleſs it be waſhed, they eat not. The 'ſame Way read all the Oriental Verſions, the *Arabic*, '*Ethopic*, and *Perſic*. Now this muſt be underſtood of 'thoſe Things that may be, and are proper to be waſhed, 'as Herbs, *&c.* And no Body will queſtion but that the 'Manner of the Waſhing theſe, was by putting them 'into Water. But

'2. If the Words deſign the Waſhing of Perſons, they 'muſt be underſtood either of the Waſhing of their whole 'Bodies, or elſe of ſome Part only, as their Hands or 'Feet: It ſeems moſt likely, that the Waſhing of the 'whole Body is intended, as *Grotius*, *Vatablus*, *Druſius*, 'and others think, becauſe waſhing of Hands is mentioned in the preceding Verſe. Beſides, to underſtand 'it thus, better expreſſes the outward, affected Sanctity 'of the more ſuperſtitious Part of the People. All the '*Jews* waſhed their Hands and Feet before eating: But 'thoſe who pretended to a greater Degree of Holineſs, 'waſhed their whole Bodies, eſpecially when they came 'from a Market. And of this total Ablution of the 'Body, is *Luke* xi. 38. to be underſtood. And here I 'can't forbear mentioning a Paſſage of the great *Scaliger*, 'to this Purpoſe. The more ſuperſtitious Part of the '*Jews* (ſays he) not only waſhed their Feet, but their 'whole Body. Hence they were called *Hemerobaptiſts*, who

† Defence of the antient Mode of Baptizing, pag. 30.

'who every Day waſhed their Bodies before they ſat 'down to Food; wherefore the Phariſee which had in-'vited Jeſus to dine with him, wondered that he ſat 'down to Meat before he had waſhed his whole Body, '*Luke* xi. But thoſe that were more free from Superſti-'tion, were contented with waſhing of their Feet, inſtead 'of that Univerſal *Immerſion*. Witneſs the *Lord* him-'ſelf, who being entertain'd at Dinner by another Pha-'riſee, objected to him, when he was ſat down to Meat, 'that he had given him no Water for his Feet.' *Luke* 7.

In a Word, we further learn from the Teſtimonies of theſe great Men, how falſe and inconcluſive Mr. *F*'s Reaſonings be, 'That if the *Jews* were baptized when only 'their Hands were waſhed, then to baptize a Part of the 'Body is true Scripture Baptiſm,' Seeing there are different Words made Uſe of in Scripture, whereby the waſhing of Hands, and the Immerſion or Ablution of the whole Body are expreſſed: And alſo, that waſhing the whole Body in Water, by dipping or overwhelming (as we do) is true Scripture Baptiſm, according to the Meaning of the Word (Baptize) and nothing elſe.

And quite as inconcluſive is that which Mr. *F.* offers from the Inſtance of Chriſt waſhing his Diſciples Feet, *John* xiii. to infer from thence, that it is not neceſſary to apply the Myſtical Water of Baptiſm ſave only to a Part of the Body, when the Word *Baptize* is not mentioned there, and when the Caſes have no Relation to each other, is manifeſtly weak and abſurd.

If our Opponents would make this Inſtance ſerve their Turn, they ſhould have ſome total Waſhing of the whole Body to go before Baptiſm, that they may be found to have ſome Colour for their Practice, anſwerable to the Text; *He* that is waſhed, *needeth not ſave only* to waſh his Feet.

I believe none will think this Paſſage to be of any Uſe for Information, reſpecting the Mode of Baptizing; unleſs they be ſuch who are pertinaciouſly reſolved to continue in their received Practice of Sprinkling (Right or Wrong) and are willing to catch at any Thing (tho' ever ſo remote and inſufficient) to help themſelves with, a little

tle longer. But I need not ſpend Time about ſuch trivial and impertinent Reaſonings---When the Pœdo-baptiſts themſelves confeſs, that the native and proper Signification of the Word is to *dip* or *plunge*, therefore pouring a little Water on the Face, is not Baptizing the Perſon: Indeed to ſcatter a few Drops of Water upon the *Child*, whether it be upon his *Face*, his *Back*, Hands or Feet (for our poor Opponents have no Rule to direct them in the Caſe) cannot properly be called *Waſhing* the Child or Perſon, at all. But Mr. *F.* tells us, he has yet a more full Argument from *Mark* vii. 4. 'And many 'other Things there be, which they have received to 'hold, as the Waſhing (in the *Greek Baptiſmous*, that is 'the Baptiſms) of Pots and Cups, brazen Veſſels and 'Tables. 'Tis plain, *Firſt*, that Baptiſm is here tranſlated Waſhing. And, *2dly*, That theſe Waſhings 'or Baptiſms, cannot be underſtood of Dipping under 'Water only; for every one knows, that Tables are 'not waſh'd by Dipping them under Water; but by 'applying Water to them, and pouring it on them.' *Anſ.* What may be the preſent Cuſtom of Waſhing Tables (or Beds) is nothing to the Purpoſe in Hand; Mr. *F.* ought to have ſhewn how the *Jews* waſhed them, before his Argument will be of any Force in this Controverſy. But with Mr. *Rees* * I Anſwer, 'When *Bap-* 'tiſmos is applied to their waſhing of *Cups*, *Pots*, *Veſſels* 'and *Tables*, 'tis very eaſily accounted for. They ſu-'perſtitiouſly abuſed a Ceremony of Gods own Appoint-'ment, *Lev.* xi. 32. for the Lord had commanded, '*that whether it be a Veſſel of Wood, or Raiment, or Skin, 'or Sack*, whatſoever Veſſel it be, it muſt be PUT IN-'TO *Water*. But how theſe Things could be *put into 'Water*, without *Dipping* of them, can't well be imagi-'ned. And if legal Pollutions required the Waſhing of '*Garments*, *Skins*, and *Sacks*, and *Utenſils* of all Sorts, 'except Earthen Veſſels, which were to be broken, then 'I ſay, 'tis no Wonder that theſe fanciful People the '*Jews*, abuſed the firſt Inſtitution of this Ceremony, 'by ridiculouſly waſhing almoſt every Thing, and their

'*Beds*

* Infant Baptiſm no Inſtitution of Chriſt, pag. 123.

'*Beds* amongſt other *Implements.*' Hence the Concluſion, which juſtles Mr. *Finley*'s out of its Place, is, That *Dipping* or *Plunging*, is truly and properly Baptiſm, according to the Import of the Word, and its Uſe in this Place.

As to what is advanc'd from *Heb.* ix. 10. *That the Apoſtle refers to all the Ceremonial Purifications* and *Cleanſings* without Limitation, 'tis too large to be true; for at the 19 Ver. where he ſpeaks of the Purification by Blood, he uſeth another Word *(Errhantiſe)* which ſignifies, and is accordingly render'd *(ſprinkled)* Mr. *F.* is pleaſed to ſay, 'The Apoſtle in Verſe 19 of this Chap-'ter, calls ſome of theſe *Baptiſms* Sprinklings.' To which the Words of the *famous* and *pious* Mr. *Keach*, are not improper for a Reply. 'Whether that Word in 'Heb. ix. 10. is the ſame (which is uſed) in *Heb.* ix. '19. is it there *Baptizo* or *Rantizo?* ſpeak, and confeſs 'your Ignorance, or elſe acknowledge your Sin in going 'about to deceive the People, by making them believe 'that Sprinkling is in *Greek* Baptiſm, or Baptizing: 'For tho' Waſhing in *Heb.* ix. 10. is Baptiſm, or Bap-'tizing, yet in *Heb.* ix. 19. *Sprinkling* both the Book 'and People, you muſt needs know is in the *Greek*, '*Rantizing* ‡.' To this I ſhall ſubjoin what the Rev. Mr. *Gill* obſerves-- † 'And ſays our Author, *It is* '*evident from the Word of God, that thoſe Waſhings gene-*'*nerally ſtood in pouring or ſprinkling of Water*; but that's 'a *Miſtake* of his, for they neither ſtood in them gene-'rally, nor particularly; for thoſe ceremonial Ablutions 'were always perform'd by *bathing*, or *dipping* in Wa-'ter, and are called, *Diapheroi*, *divers*, or *different*, 'not becauſe they were performed different Ways, as 'ſome by *Sprinkling*, others by *Pouring*, and others by '*Plunging*; but becauſe of the different Perſons and 'Things the Subjects thereof; as the *Prieſts*, *Levites*, '*Iſraelites*, *Veſſels*, *Garments*, *&c.* And here it mayn't 'be omiſs to obſerve what *Maimonides*, who was one of 'the moſt learned of the *Jewiſh* Writers, ſays concern-

'ing

‡ Anſ. to Mr. *James Owen*, pag. 166. † Antient Mode of Baptiſm, pag. 68.

' ing this Matter. *Wherever* (ſays he) *the Waſhing* of the ' Fleſh or Garment is mentioned in the Law, it means ' nothing elſe than the Waſhing of the whole Body; for ' if a Man waſhes himſelf all over, excepting the very *Tip* ' of his little Finger, he is ſtill in his Uncleanneſs. Nay, ' he ſays, 'tis neceſſary that every Hair of his Head ' ſhould be waſhed; and therefore the Apoſtle might ' well call theſe Waſhings *Baptiſms*.'

Hence it appears, that Mr. *F*'s Opponent, whoever he was, whom he labours to expoſe, may juſtly reſume his Argument, and ſay, that thoſe ceremonial Ablutions, which the Apoſtle calls Baptiſms, were always perform'd by bathing or dipping in Water, and therefore to baptize, *only* ſignifies *to dip*; ſeeing at the 19th Verſe of the 9th Chapter of the *Hebrews*, another Word is uſed, which ſignifies to ſprinkle.

Says our Author, ' I next advance three parallel ' Texts, in each of which the Word *Baptize*, ſignifies ' not *to dip*, but *to ſprinkle*, viz. *Mat.* iii. 11. *Mark* i. ' 8. *Luke* iii. 16. *He ſhall baptize you with the Holy* ' *Ghoſt and with Fire*.' He ſuggeſts, that to tranſlate the Words thus, He ſhall dip you with (or in) the Holy Ghoſt,---*would be ſhocking, and grates our Ears at firſt Hearing*.--But by the Way, I think 'tis a very ſmooth and eaſy Verſion, to ſay, *I dip you in Water*, as he confeſſes the Particle [*en*] may be rendered; ſo that the Places wherein the Word *Baptizo*, is uſed in a proper and literal Senſe, conſtantly make for us---But in theſe Texts (and ſome others) 'tis manifeſtly uſed in a figurative Senſe or Meaning; and therefore to infer from the metaphorical Uſe of the Word, a *Meaning* different from its allowed native and proper Signification, is unreaſonable and very unfair, as well as falſe Way of Arguing: And yet Mr. *F.* does ſo from theſe Texts, with as much Confidence, as if the Word was uſed in them in its literal or proper Senſe: When he pretends to anſwer the Queſtion, What is it to be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, and how performed? He ſays the Scriptures EVERY WHERE expreſs this by *pouring* forth his Influences on Perſons. Mr. *F.* ſhould try whether the Verſion would not be every

Way

Way as *ſhocking* and *grating* to his Ears, as that which he rejects, *viz.* to ſay, *He ſhall pour you with (or in) the Holy Ghoſt?* According to his wild and looſe Way of Reaſoning, the Word *(Baptizing)* may as well ſignify *Sending*, or *Giving*, becauſe we read of ſending the Spirit, *Gal.* iv. 6. and giving the Spirit, 1 *John* iv. 13. and ſo inſtead of coming at the true literal Signification of the Word, we ſhall be led into the greateſt Confuſion imaginable.

The Reader is deſired to obſerve, that what is intended by being baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, *&c.* is that extraordinary Donation of the Spirit, on the Day of *Pentecoſt*, as is manifeſt from *Acts* i. 5. *Ye ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, not many Days hence*; which was fulfilled on the Day of *Pentecoſt.* Acts ii. 2.---*When ſuddenly there came a Sound from Heaven, as of a ruſhing mighty Wind, and it* filled all the *Houſe, where they were ſitting, and there appeared unto them Cloven Tongues, like as of Fire, and it ſate upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt.* Now if there is any Argument at all can be form'd from the metaphorical Uſe of the Word in theſe Paſſages of Holy Scripture, 'tis plainly in our Favour; for as a Perſon is ſurrounded, overwhelmed, and covered in the Water of Baptiſm, ſo the Diſciples were ſurrounded, overwhelmed, and covered with the Holy Ghoſt on the Day of *Pentecoſt*; *when the Spirit like a mighty ruſhing Wind*, filled all the Houſe, *where they were ſitting, and in the Appearance of Cloven Tongues ſat upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghoſt.* Hence to ſay he ſhall baptize you in the Holy Ghoſt, does not ſeem ſo very ſtrange and diſagreeable; for they were as if they had been dipped or plunged all over therein. I ſay if theſe Texts are of any Uſe in the preſent Controverſy, they ſerve to exemplify what we maintain, that the Word ſignifies properly *to dip*, *&c.* and accounting for the Phraſe, as above, you ſee it carries in it a beautiful Alluſion to the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, by Immerſion only, and no other Way. Further, I don't find the common Influences and Operations of the Spirit upon the Souls of Men, to be any where in Scripture called, *Baptizing with the Holy Ghoſt*; and if any

any one will enlighten me of any Error in my preſent Way of thinking, I ſhall be obliged to him. In the mean Time I maintain againſt the *enthuſiaſtic* Notions of thoſe Perſons, who under Pretence of holding the Baptiſm of the Spirit, do utterly reject this ſacred Goſpel Ordinance of Water Baptiſm, That none in our Day can be ſaid to be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt; ſince extraordinary Gifts, were peculiar to extraordinary Times only. If the Work of the Holy Ghoſt in Converſion (or in the after progreſſive Work of Sanctification) was the Thing intended by the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, the Apoſtles and Diſciples would have been baptized with the Holy Ghoſt long before the Day of Pentecoſt, which they were not.

This alſo ſerves to enervate Mr. *F*'s Arguings from theſe Texts in favour of his Practice; for the Word *Baptizo*, is manifeſtly uſed in them *metaphorically*; and the Reaſon why this metaphorical Phraſe is uſed, is not with Reference to the common Influences of the Spirit, expreſt by Pouring or Sprinkling; but with Reference to the then well-known Mode and Practice of Baptizing in Water, as being expreſſive of that extraordinary Donation of the Holy Spirit: And conſidering the Account which the Scripture gives us of the Manner how the Diſciples were baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, it does *not obſcurely* point out to us, the ancient *Mode* of Baptizing.

Upon the whole, Mr. *F.* is ſo far from proving from theſe Texts, that *Baptizo* ſignifies to ſprinkle, that the Scripture Account makes utterly againſt his Aſſertion. And when we review all the Evidences he pretends to bring for his Opinion, he manifeſtly fails to cite one ſingle Inſtance, either from *Lexico-graphers*, *Divines*, or *Scripture*, where *Baptizo* is rendered or ſignifies to *pour* or *ſprinkle*; ſo that for ought he has ſaid, the *Baptiſts* may reſt as confident as before, that *Baptizo*, *natively* and *properly* ſignifies to *dip* or *plunge*; and conſequently, that none can be ſaid to be baptized, according to the Meaning of the Word, and the Uſe of it in Scripture, but theſe who are *dipp'd*.

Mr.

Mr. *F.* proceeds next to the Scripture Examples which we bring for Immerſion, and labours all *he can* to render thoſe evident Places doubtful, and becloud the Light which they give us in the Affair, that if poſſible *Room* may be made for his *Opinion* and *Practice*. The Texts are, *Mark* i. 5. *And there went out unto him all the Land of* Judea, *and they of* Jeruſalem, *and were all* baptized of him in the River of *Jordan*, *confeſſing their Sins*. *Mat.* iii. 5, 6. *Mark* i. 9. *And it came to paſs in thoſe Days, that Jeſus came from* Nazareth *of* Galilee, *and was* baptized *of* John *in* Jordan. *Matt.* iii. 16. *And Jeſus when he was baptized, went up ſtraightway* out of the Water. *John* iii. 23. *And* John *alſo was baptizing in* Enon, *near to* Salim, *becauſe there* was much Water *there*; *and they came, and* were baptized. *Acts* viii. 38, 39. *And they* went down both into the Water, both Philip *and* the Eunuch, *and he baptized him*. *And when they were come* up out of the Water, *the Spirit of the Lord caught away* Philip.

Remembring what the *Pædo-baptiſts* grant us, that *Baptizo natively* and *properly* ſignifies to *dip* or *plunge*, theſe Texts are ſo full and *clear* in our Favour, that Baptiſm is rightly adminiſtred by Immerſion, as to need no Explanation; and indeed it would be but to light a *Candle* to ſee the *Sun* by, to do it. My preſent Buſineſs therefore, ſhall be to refute what Mr. *F.* has thought proper to object againſt us, and vindicate the Truth held forth in theſe Places of Scripture. Says our Author, 'If *John* had 'preached in *Jeruſalem*, and afterwards gone out to a 'River or Pool to baptize his new Converts, there would 'have been ſome Colour of Probability that he plunged 'them.' *Anſ.* When I read this Paſſage, I can't forbear thinking of what the chief Prieſts, Scribes, and Elders ſaid once, when Chriſt was on the Croſs, *If he be the King of* Iſrael, *let him now come down from the Croſs, and we will believe him*. Yes, to be ſure! they promiſe fair, if Chriſt would do as they would have it. Juſt as if there was not ſufficient Evidence of his being the Son of God, and King of *Iſrael*, without all this! But who can Number the *Objections* which *Unbelief* will invent! Tho' it is not my Deſign to ſet Mr. *F.* upon a Level with thoſe

obdurate

obdurate Creatures in other Points, yet his Objection here is a *Coin* of the ſame *Mint* with theirs; only one Side it happens not to have the Promiſe to believe, in ſuch fair *Capitals* as theirs had, if the Thing required was granted. But (pray) is there no Colour of Probability that *John* dipp'd or plung'd his new Converts without this? when he baptized them in the River of *Jordan*; when he adminiſtred the Ordinance in *Enon*, becauſe there was much Water there; when Chriſt himſelf was baptized in *Jordan*, and afterwards *came up out* of the Water. Again, is there no Colour of Probability that he plung'd them, when the People went out to him from *Jeruſalem*, &c. not only to hear him preach, but alſo with a Deſign to be baptized by him? as is clear in the Caſe of the Phariſees and Sadducees, who came forth to be baptized; whom he rejected, becauſe they were not qualified Perſons, *Matt.* iii. 7. *Luke* iii. 7. Chap. 7, 29, 30. Put all this together, and 'twill not only amount to give a Colour of Probability that the People were immers'd by *John*, but to a very ſufficient and ſatisfying Evidence they were ſo.

'We don't read (ſays he) that *John* baptized at *Jordan*, becauſe it contain'd much Water; but becauſe it 'contain'd *real* Water, and was convenient for that pre-'ſent Time.' *Anſ.* What poor Shifts is our Author put to in his oppoſing the ſcriptural Mode of Baptiſm. Will Mr. *F.* tell us what Rivers or Brooks of Water thoſe are, wherein the Water is not *real* Water? or was real Water to be found in the River of *Jordan* only? I deſire him to produce the Place where he reads that *John* baptized in *Jordan*, becauſe it contain'd *real* Water.

We have review'd our Argument, and find it ſtands very well, and as yet unmovable, being confirm'd by the proper Signification of the Word, *Baptize*, the Places where Baptiſm was adminiſtred, even in a River, and where there was much Water; and other Circumſtances of its Adminiſtration: All which do harmoniouſly concur to eſtabliſh the Point that Baptizing is Dipping; conſequently *John* dipt the People in *Jordan*.

Mr. *F.* endeavours to aſſign ſufficient Reaſon for *John*'s baptizing in *Enon*, without ſuppoſing him to do ſo for the

Sake

Sake of Plunging: 'In order hereto (ſays he) obſerve 'that the Original is *hudata polla*, that is, *many Waters*, 'a Place of Rivulets and Springs; there might be ſeveral 'ſmall Streams, yet none of them deep enough to plunge 'one in; nor can the contrary be made appear.' *Anſ.* With *more* Juſtneſs I may ſay, there might be ſeveral large Streams, and all of them deep enough to plunge People in; nor can the contrary be made appear. Our Opponents run one after another in their bare Aſſertions, that theſe many Waters were little or ſmall Streams, or many Springs--But why don't they give us ſome Inſtances where the original Words muſt be ſo underſtood? or ſome ſubſtantial Reaſons to confirm what they ſay, from this Place. But that this is an idle Evaſion of theirs, will appear from the Uſe of the ſame Words, by the ſame divine Penman, in other Parts of his Writings.

Rev. i. 15.---*And his Voice as the Sound* hudatoon polloon *of* many Waters: Small Streams or Rivulets, have either no Sound at all, or at the moſt but very little, inſufficient to anſwer the Deſign of the Apoſtle, in his uſing theſe Words; which was to ſet forth the *Voice* of Chriſt to be a mighty loud Voice, terrible to his Enemies, or powerful to raiſe Men from the Death of Sin; *high and great, heard afar off, and very terrible and dreadful*; as the Rev. Mr. *Durham* notes; which could not be repreſented but by the Sound of much, or great Waters. The Reader may further conſult *Rev.* xiv. 2. *Chap.* xvii. 1. *Chap.* xix. 6. where the ſame Phraſe is uſed in the Original; in all which Places, it can't be underſtood to mean or allude to little Streams, or Rivulets; and therefore we have no need to queſtion but the Words in the Place under Conſideration, do alſo ſignify *much Water*, as our *Engliſh* Verſion reads it, ſufficient for the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm by Immerſion, notwithſtanding the trifling and inſignificant Objections of our Opponents to the contrary.

Again, it is worthy our obſerving, that the Holy Ghoſt gives us the Reaſon why *John* baptized in *Ænon*, viz. *becauſe there was much Water there*: Now 'tis plain that the Mode of Baptizing by Immerſion, is the only

Mode which requires much Water in the Adminiſtration of this Ordinance; all other *pretended* Modes by Pouring or Sprinkling require but very little, a Baſon full carried into a Meeting Houſe, or elſewhere, would go a great Ways: If it be ſuppoſed that relation is herein had to ſomething elſe, and not to ſuch a Mode of Baptiſm, which requires much Water in the Adminiſtration of it, the Reaſon here given by the Holy Ghoſt, would not at all be expreſſive, or illuſtrative, why *John* baptized where there was much Water, any more than elſewhere; and to uſe Mr. *F*'s Words, *Can we once think that the Holy Ghoſt ſhould thus faulter in expreſſing himſelf? far be it from us: As for me, I ſhall an Hundred Times ſooner chuſe to impute Abſurdity and Nonſenſe to our Opponents Reaſonings, than to the Holy Scriptures, ſince I muſt impute ſuch Things to one of them.* Indeed to ſay as our Opponents do, 'That *John* had need to be where there was plenty of 'Water, that the People and their Horſes, and Camels, 'might drink.' That this ſhould be imagined to be the Reaſon why he baptized where there was much Water, is ſuch a wild extravagant Fancy, that deſerves not a ſerious Anſwer, when there is no Intimation of any ſuch Thing in the Text, or Context. But any Thing to colour their Argument, and blind the Reader with. I can't but obſerve Mr. *F*'s Inadvertency in Writing (to ſay no worſe of it) when he repreſents the Matter as if the great Multitudes from *Jeruſalem*, and all *Judea*, and from the Region round about *Jordan*, were baptized of *John* in *Ænon*; when the Scripture is plain that the Multitudes were baptized in *Jordan*, *Mark* i. 5. Our Author might have obſerved, that when *John* was baptizing in *Ænon*, the Crowds then attended the Miniſtry of Chriſt, *John* iii. 26. for *John* was on the declining Hand, *John* iii. 30. But this Obſervation, it ſeems, would not ſo well ſuit with Mr. *F*'s Deſign and Way of Accounting for *John*'s Adminiſtring the Ordinance where there was much Water, *viz.* that the Multitudes, with their Horſes and Camels, might have Water to drink.

Another Device Mr. *F.* has found out, why *John* baptized where Water was plenty, is, 'That he might

'cut

'cut off all Occaſion of Offence from the ceremonious 'Jews, who would be apt to ſtumble at his uſing what 'they would count polluted Water; eſpecially ſeeing 'that they had a Law made concerning a ſolemn Puri-'fication, which required freſh running Water, *Num.* 'xix. 17, 18.'-- *Anſ.* If there is any Thing to the Purpoſe in all this, Mr. *F.* juſt helps on our Argument; for according to that Law of Purification, the unclean Perſon was not cleans'd till the Seventh Day, when he was to *waſh his Clothes, and bathe himſelf in Water, and he ſhould be clean at Even*, ver. 19. Now if it was ſo that *John* intended to cut off all Occaſion of Offence from the ceremonious *Jews*, he muſt not only uſe *running Water*, but alſo dip the Perſons in it, anſwerable to the unclean Perſon's bathing himſelf in Water, for his compleat Purification, or Cleanſing; otherwiſe the ceremonious *Jews* might ſtill have Occaſion of Offence, becauſe they well knew, even from the Inſtance Mr. *F.* cites, that the unclean Perſon was not purified by the Water ſprinkled on him, but by *waſhing his Clothes, and bathing himſelf in Water.*

'Beſides (ſays he) it appears not, that the Wilder-'neſs of *Judea* afforded Water ſufficient for the afore-'ſaid Purpoſes.' *Anſ.* 'Tis even aſtoniſhing how *weak* and *impertinent* our Opponent does object! Had the Wilderneſs of *Judea*, or the Land of *Canaan*, elſewhere been as dry as the *Sandy Deſerts* of *Arabia*, it would not affect our Argument from this Inſtance, when according to the Scriptures we affirm that there was Water enough in thoſe *Places* where *John* adminiſtred the Ordinance to dip Perſons all over, *viz. In the River Jordan, and in Ænon*; which is ſufficient to our Purpoſe. And as to the Objection of the *Scarcity* of Water in the Land of *Canaan*, 'tis fully anſwer'd in *Deut.* viii. 7. *For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good Land, a Land of* Brooks *of* Water, *of* Fountains, *and* Depths *that ſpring out of* Valleys *and* Hills.

As to any further Objections, which Mr. *F.* is pleas'd to advance againſt Immerſion, the Scriptural Mode of Baptiſm; 'tis obſervable, that the *Jews* (who were al-

ways accuſtom'd to their legal Purifications, which requir'd waſhing of their Clothes, and bathing their Fleſh in Water) can't be ſuppoſed to be ſo ſcant of Raiment for ſuch Uſes, or ſo much at a Loſs how to preſerve the Rules of Modeſty and Decency, in their Submiſſion to Baptiſm by Immerſion, as our Author ſuggeſts; and I believe the Reaſon why our Opponents advance ſuch ſimple Objections againſt the *ancient Mode of Baptizing*, is for want of better Argument; ſeeing they can't overthrow what they oppoſe, they labour to make it look odious and ridiculous to the World, and then conclude, *there is not one good Argument to prove that John baptiſed by Dipping, but many againſt it.* I confeſs our Opponents do indeed bring many Arguments againſt it, but they are ſo far from being *good*, that they deſerve no ſuch Title, being in themſelves but mere *Quibbles*, and trifling *Evaſions*, that I admire Men of *Senſe* and *Learning* would be guilty of uſing them.

Let us briefly conſider what Mr. *F.* ſays concerning theſe Texts, *Mat.* iii. 16. *Acts* viii. 38, 39. Here he ſays, 'The whole Force of their Argument depends on 'the ſmall Prepoſitions *into* and *out of*, which they ſuppoſe prove them to have been dipt.' *Anſ.* Who thoſe are that ſuppoſe thus, I can't ſay: Did he ever read any Baptiſt Author, that argues after the Manner he talks? We argue from theſe Circumſtances, that Chriſt, our glorious *Pattern*, as well as our gracious Redeemer, and alſo the *Eunuch*, were in the Water, when they were baptized; and from the Signification of the Word, *&c.* that they were *dipt*. I ſhall juſt take Notice of what Mr. *F.* ſays about theſe Prepoſitions, *Apo*, *Ek*, and *Eis*. And in Reſpect of *Apo*, he finds Fault with the *learned Tranſlators* of the *Bible*, for rendering *apo tou hudatos*, Mat. iii. 16. *out of the Water*; and tells us, 'This I am *bold* 'to ſay, ought to have been rendered *from the Water*, 'and can appeal to all who underſtand the Language, 'that *apo* ſtrictly and properly ſignifies *from*, and not 'out of.' *Anſ.* But what is gain'd by this low Criticiſm? truly nothing at all; for Chriſt was not baptized on the Banks of the River, but *in Jordan*, Mark i. 9. then every one knows he muſt come up *out of* the Waters of

of *Jordan*. Conſequently upon due Examination, our *Engliſh* Tranſlation is not corrupt in this as Mr. *F.* ſuggeſts, but very well expreſſes the *Meaning* of the Prepoſition *apo* in this Place; and how Mr. *F.* can underſtand it otherwiſe, I can't readily imagine. When he ſpeaks of appealing to the Learned upon this Occaſion, I ſuppoſe he means thoſe that are byas'd to his Way of thinking; for our learned Tranſlators, no Doubt, thought that *Apo* in the controverted Place, properly ſignifies *out of*, and have rendered it accordingly.

Mr. *F*'s Memory certainly very much fails him, or elſe he has not read the *New Teſtament*; when he ſays, 'Nor do I at preſent *remember* one Place in all the Bible, 'beſides this, where it is tranſlated *out of*; but com-'monly *of*, or *from*.' Let him conſult *Luke* iv. 35. *apo autou*, *out of him*. Verſe 41. *apo polloon*, *out of many*. Luke viii. 29. *apo tou Anthropou*, *out of the Man*. So Verſe 33. Acts xvii. 2. *apo toon Graphoon*, *out of the Scriptures*. Theſe Inſtances may ſuffice to help his *Memory*, while he looks for more. Here I would aſk Mr. *F.* whether *Apo* in theſe Places, does not *ſtrictly* and *properly* ſignify *out of*.

He acknowledges that the Prepoſitions *Eis*, and *Ek*, do often ſignify *into* and *out of*, there is therefore no Neceſſity I ſhould bring Inſtances to ſhew they do ſo. But then we muſt ſhew they ſignify ſo in the controverted Place, *Acts* viii. 38, 39. If we take it for granted that they do ſignify *into* and *out of*, as our Tranſlators have rendered them in the diſputed Place, Mr. *F.* can never ſhew to the contrary but we are right; and it was his Buſineſs, if he had done any Thing to Purpoſe, to ſhew that we miſtook the Signification of theſe Prepoſitions in the ſaid Place, or that they are wrong tranſlated; doing leſs than this, was doing of nothing but making a Noiſe and Bluſter in vain. However, we have an Argument with a *tolerable good Face* to it, that *eis* and *ek*, in *Acts* viii. 38, 39. do ſignify *into* and *out of*; becauſe Mr. *F.* aſſerts in the * Page before me, that *Philip came up out of the Water, as well as the Eunuch*. Then they certainly were both in it. 'Tis very natural then, to un-

 derſtand

* 93.

derſtand that *eis to hudoor* ſignifies *into the Water*, or elſe how could Mr. *F.* aſſert, they both came up *out of* the Water, if they were never in it? Thus Mr. *F.* at *unawares* confirms all that we plead for, *viz.* that *Eis* and *Ek* in this Place, do ſignify *into*, and *out of*.

Having clear'd our Way ſo far, 'tis proper to obſerve, that this Paſſage concerning *Philip*'s baptizing the Eunuch, ſets the Matter in ſuch a clear Light, that no Objection of any Weight, can poſſibly be made againſt what we do profeſs: Here the Holy Ghoſt very particularly obſerves unto us, That they came *unto* a certain Water; that they both *went down into the Water*; and, that the Matter might be yet clearer, 'tis added, *both Philip* and the *Eunuch*; that he baptized *(i. e.* dipped) him; that they both came up *out of the Water*: Nothing can be plainer, unleſs one was to have ſeen the Ordinance adminiſtred, with his own Eyes. Hence *Calvin* on the Place ſays, * 'Here we ſee what was the Rite of Baptizing with the Antients; for they plunged the whole Body into Water.' And pray for what Reaſon did the Holy Ghoſt pen the Account ſo particular, but for our Learning and Imitation? And,

Why ſhould our Mother's Children be angry with us, for pleading that Baptiſm ought now to be adminiſtred according to the Apoſtolical and Primitive Practice, ſo as to *load* us with Reproaches, Contempt, and Diſdain; ſeeing in this Particular, we only act according to the *ſhining* Example of JESUS CHRIST, and his bleſſed Followers.

Mr. *F.* goes on in his impertinent Way, and talks as if we thought a Perſon could not go *into*, or come up *out of* the Water, without being plung'd under it, or have been at the Bottom: We know he may go into the Water an Hundred Times, without being plung'd under it--But how vaſtly different is that from the Caſe in Hand! when the Adminiſtrator, and Perſon to be baptized, do both go down into the Water, the one to baptize, the other to be baptized (as in the Caſe of *Philip* and the *Eunuch)* Here we ſay, the one goes down into the Water

* Cited by Mr. Gill, Ancient Mode of Bapt. p. 45.

ter, in order to be baptized, and comes up a baptized Perſon. And for ought that yet appears, we have no Reaſon to be aſhamed of our Argument, as Mr. *F.* ſuggeſts.

Says our Antagoniſt, 'They that go down to the 'Sea in Ships, *Pſalm* cvii. 23. are not ſuppoſed to go 'under the Water.' An't they? Let him aſk Sea-faring Men then, if they don't go under the Water, when the ſtormy Wind ariſeth, which lifteth up the Waves of the Sea that they are mounted up to Heaven, and they go down again to the Depths; their Soul is melted becauſe of Trouble; and I believe they'll inform him, there is nothing more common than for the vexed Surges to break over them at ſuch Times. How impertinent therefore is this Inſtance to what Mr. *F.* is upon? 'If '*out of the Water* (ſays he) ſignify the ſame as from un-'der it, we can then prove, that *Philip* was plung'd as 'well as the *Eunuch*.' In Anſwer to this, and what Mr. *F.* cites out of Dr. *Ridgely*, Mr. *Rees* his Reply is ſufficient. 'Nor is there any one that ſuppoſed *Philip* and 'the *Eunuch* were *all over*, and properly with their '*whole Bodies* at the *Bottom* of that Water; but that 'they firſt ſtood in it, and that *Philip* put the *whole Body* 'of the *Eunuch* entirely under the Surface of the Water, 'ſo that he might be ſaid to be all over covered there-'with: And afterwards they both *went*, or *walked* out *of* '*the Water*. But the learned Dr. has hit upon as odd a 'Notion of *coming out of the Water*, as I think was ever 'heard of; when he ſays, (p. 418) Where Perſons are 'ſaid to come up out of the Water, it denotes an Action 'performed with Deſign, and the perfect Exerciſe of the 'Underſtanding, in him that does it; which ſeems not 'agreeable to one who is at the Bottom of the Water, 'and can't well come up from thence, unleſs by the 'Help of him that baptized him. Now for this very 'Reaſon which the *Doctor* offers himſelf, 'tis probable, 'that 'tis the firſt Time that this Motion was ever called '*coming out of the Water*; the Scripture never calls it ſo, 'that I know of: For in ſtrict Propriety of Speech, and 'good Senſe, this Part which we are ſpeaking of *(emer-*

'ging) ſhould be called *Riſing*, or being *rais'd out of the* 'Water. Accordingly St. *Ambroſe* calls it, *Reſurgimur*, 'Reſuſcitamur, *i. e.* We are *riſen*, or *rais'd* again. But 'then it is eaſy to conceive, that when a Perſon has been 'thus *rais'd*, and *plac'd* upon his Legs after his Baptiſm, 'he may make uſe of his Underſtanding, in *going*, or 'walking up *out of the Water*. Dr. *Hammond* was ſo well 'ſatisfied in this, that when ſpeaking of the Baptiſm of 'our LORD, he ſays, *He went out of the Water before* 'John. And 'tis very natural to conceive thus, of this 'Affair: For the *Adminiſtrator* is commonly the *Firſt* 'who goes *into*, and the *Laſt* who comes *out of* the *Wa*-'ter, in performing the Ordinance of Baptiſm. I ob-'ſerve further, that the worthy Dr. *Ridgely* repeats the 'Term, *Bottom of the Water*, in this Diſpute. There 'is no great Need for this Phraſe; for we never deſire to 'put Perſons to the *Bottom* of the *Font*, but only under 'the *Surface of the Water*, ſo as that their Bodies may be '*once* covered *all over*, and then they are immediately '*rais'd up*, and this is ſufficient to anſwer the End of the 'Ordinance.' ‡

Mr. *F.* offers ſome further Objections againſt Immerſi-on; but they are very inconſiderable, as, 'That we ne-'ver read of any going *into*, or out of the Water, ſave 'only when they were in the Woods, or on the Road; 'then whoever would be baptized, muſt go where the 'Water was; and not having *Veſſels* to take it up with-'al, it was therefore convenient to go a little Way '*into the Water*, that the *Baptizer* might more readily 'take it up with his Hand.' To this, and what follows it, much of the ſame Nature, I Anſwer, I preſume to ſay, he does not read any where, that Water was brought to any Houſe, to *pour* or *ſprinkle* upon Perſons; but we read of People's going *out of Jeruſalem*, and elſewhere, to *John* to be baptized: To ſuppoſe that the Eunuch had no *Veſſels* with him in the Chariot, is very improbable -- or that it was uſual for the *Baptizers* then, to go a little Way into the Water, for the greater Conveniency to take it up with their Hands (I ſuppoſe he means to ſprin-kle on the People) is ſuch a ſimple Way of Accounting for Things,

‡ Animad. on a Diſcourſe of Inf. Bapt. p. 278.

Things, as can be. What *Impediments* or *Diſeaſes* does Mr. *Finley* fancy thoſe Baptizers laboured under, that they could not well reach to take Water up, unleſs they went ſome Diſtance into it? We ſee what ſorry Shifts Men are put to, for to find ſome Conjectures, whereby they would endeavour to *turn aſide* the plain Truth of Things: To what he ſays further, I would juſt aſk him, Does he not read of great Multitudes going from their dwelling Places away to *John*, and were baptized by him in the River of *Jordan?* And when *John* was baptizing in *Ænon*, becauſe there was much Water there, does not he read of others coming to him, and were baptized of him there? And where does Mr. *F.* think they came from, but *out of* their Houſes and Cities? So that there appears not only a Probability, but a very great Certainty, that Baptiſm was anciently adminiſtred by Immerſion.

Another Objection is, 'That the Apoſtles preached 'wherever they came; wherever they preach'd, ſome 'were converted.---Now they were not always nigh to 'Rivers or Ponds, nor had they Fonts erected for this 'End; they muſt then either not baptize at all, or elſe 'muſt do it ſome other Way, than by *plunging*; that is, 'by *pouring* or *ſprinkling*.' *Anſ.* Does Mr. *F.* read that the *Apoſtles* could not baptize their New Converts for want of being *nigh* to a *River* or *Pond*, that they were oblig'd to let them go unbaptiz'd, or elſe ſprinkle them; or is this a Conjecture of his own, to countenance his Practice? A Conjecture of his own no Doubt, which is of no Weight, unleſs it had been ſupported by ſome better Authority than his bare *ſay-ſo*; or he had made appear that the Apoſtles were oblig'd to ſprinkle ſome of their new Converts, for want of Water ſufficient for Immerſion; but this he has not: Neither is it in the leaſt probable that they dipped ſome, and ſprinkled others; becauſe wherever we read of their adminiſtring this Ordinance, 'tis ſtill expreſs'd by the Word *Baptize*. Now if they had uſed *different Modes* of Adminiſtration (as every one knows that *dipping* and *ſprinkling* are very different) there is all the Reaſon in the World to believe they would have been expreſſed by *different* Words; but ſeeing the ſame Word is every where uſed on this Occaſion, it plainly beſpeak

beſpeaks their Practice was *uniform*, *i. e.* that they baptized all by Immerſion. And thoſe Places where the Baptizing of Perſons is but juſt mentioned, are to be compared with other Places of Holy Scripture, which give a full and clear Account of the Manner and Circumſtances of its Adminiſtration. Upon the Whole, I can't but conclude, that Immerſion is the Scriptural, and therefore the only Mode of Baptizing; and that what Mr. *F.* offers upon this Head, in Favour of his Practice, is weak and inconcluſive.

We come to the third *Topick*, or Head of Diſcourſe which Mr. *F.* calls *Scripture Alluſions*, *Rom.* vi. 3, 4, 5. *Know ye not, that ſo many of us as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his Death? Therefore we are* buried *with him by Baptiſm into Death; that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the Dead by the Glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in Newneſs of Life. For if we have been planted together in the Likeneſs of his Death, we ſhall be alſo in the Likeneſs of his Reſurrection*; compare *Col.* ii. 12. From theſe Words we urge, that the End and Deſign of Baptiſm is to repreſent the Death, Burial, and Reſurrection, of Jeſus Chriſt; and our dying unto Sin, and riſing to walk in Newneſs of Life; the outward Sign, or Element, is Water, the only and proper Mode, is Immerſion, *buried in Baptiſm.*

I ſhall cite the Judgment of ſome Pædo-baptiſts, out of many, which favour us in this Point; and certainly 'tis reaſonable to think there muſt be very great Clearneſs in the Caſe, when thoſe who practis'd Pouring or Sprinkling, ſhould notwithſtanding grant us ſo much as they do, in their Comments upon theſe Words.

The Aſſembly of Divines on the Place; *Buried with him in Baptiſm*: 'In this *Phraſe* the Apoſtle ſeemeth to 'allude to the *antient Manner* of Baptiſm, which was to 'dip the Parties baptized, and as it were to *bury them* 'under the Water for a while, and then to draw them 'out of it, and lift them up, to repreſent the *Burial* of 'our old Man, and our Reſurrection to Newneſs of Life.

The Continuers of *Pool*'s Annotations, ſay, 'He (the 'Apoſtle) ſeems here to allude to the *Manner* of *Bap-*

'*tizing*

'*tizing* in thoſe warm *Eaſtern* Countries, which was to '*dip* or *plunge* the Party baptized, and as it were to *bury* '*him* for a while *under Water*.'

Dr. *Towerſon* * (cited by Mr. *Stennet*) treating of the Sacrament of Baptiſm, having ſpoken of Water in Baptiſm, as a *Sign in Reſpect of that cleanſing Quality which is natural to it*, adds theſe Words: 'One other Particular there is, wherein I have ſaid the Water of Baptiſm to have been intended as a Sign, and that is in Reſpect of that *Manner* of Application which was ſometimes uſed, I mean the *dipping* or *plunging* the Party baptized, in it, a Signification which St. *Paul* will not ſuffer thoſe to forget, who have been acquainted with his *Epiſtles*: For with Reference to that *Manner* of Baptizing, we find him affirming, that we are *buried with Chriſt by Baptiſm into Death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the Dead, by the Glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in Newneſs of Life, &c.* Rom. vi. 4.--To the ſame Purpoſe, or rather yet more clearly, doth that Apoſtle diſcourſe, where he tells us that as we '*are buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, ſo we do therein riſe alſo with him, through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the Dead*, Col. ii. 12. For what is this but to ſay, that as the *Deſign* of Baptiſm was to oblige Men to conform ſo far to Chriſt's Death and Reſurrection, as to die unto Sin, and to live again unto Righteouſneſs: So was it performed by the Ceremony of Immerſion, that the Perſon immers'd, might by that very Ceremony, which was no obſcure Image of a *Sepulture*, be minded of the precedent Death, as in like Manner by his coming again out of the Water, of his Riſing from that Death to Life, after the Example of the Inſtitutor thereof?'

A little lower, he enquires whether the Water of Baptiſm *ought to be applied by Immerſion, or by that, or an Aſperſion or Effuſion*? 'Which (ſays he) is a more material Queſtion, than it is commonly deem'd by us, who have been *accuſtomed* to baptiſe by a bare Effuſion, or ſprinkling of Water upon the Party. For in Things which

'depend

* Explication of the Catechiſm of the Church of England, of Bapt. p. 20.

'depend for their Force, upon the mere Will and Plea-
'ſure of *him* who inſtituted 'em, there ought, no doubt,
'great Regard to be had to the Commands of him who
'did ſo, as without which there is no Reaſon to *preſume*
'we ſhall receive the Benefit of that Ceremony to which
'he hath been pleaſed to annex it. Now, what the
'Command of Chriſt was in this Particular, (*Matt.*
'xxviii. 19.) cannot be doubted of by thoſe who ſhall
'conſider, *firſt* the Words of Chriſt concerning it, and
'the Practice of thoſe Times, whether in the Baptiſm of
'*John*, or of *our Saviour*: For the Words of Chriſt are,
'that they ſhould *baptize* or *dip* thoſe whom they made
'Diſciples to him (for ſo no doubt the Word *Baptizein*
'properly ſignifies) and which is more, and not without
'its Weight, that they ſhould baptize them into the
'Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy
'Ghoſt; thereby intimating ſuch a *Waſhing* as ſhould
'receive the Party baptized, within the very Body of that
'Water, which they were to baptize him with. Tho'
'if there could be any doubt concerning the Signification
'of the Words in themſelves, yet would that Doubt be
'removed, by conſidering the Practice of thoſe Times,
'whether in the Baptiſm of *John*, or of our Saviour.
'For ſuch as was the Practice of thoſe Times in *Bap-*
'*tizing*, ſuch in Reaſon are we to think our Saviour's
'Command to have been concerning it, eſpecially when
'the Words themſelves incline that Way; there being
'not otherwiſe any Means, either for thoſe or future
'Times, to diſcover his Intention concerning it. Now
'what the Practice of thoſe Times was as to this Particular,
'will need no other Proof than their reſorting to Rivers,
'and ſuch like *Receptacles* of Waters, for the Performance
'of that Ceremony, as that too, becauſe there was *much*
'*Water* there. For ſo the Scripture doth not only affirm
'concerning the Baptiſm of *John*; ‡ but both intimates
'concerning that which our Saviour adminiſtred in
'† *Judea* (becauſe making *John*'s Baptiſm and *his* to be
'ſo far forth of the ſame Sort) and expreſly affirms con-
'cerning the Baptiſm of the Eunuch; * which is the
only

‡ Matt. iii. 5, 6, 13. † John iii. 22, 23. * Acts viii. 38.

'only Chriſtian Baptiſm the Scripture is any thing par-
'ticular in the Deſcription of: The Words of St. *Luke*
'being, that both *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went down
'into a certain Water, which they met with in their
'Journey, in order to the Baptizing of the latter. For
'what need would there have been, either of the *Baptiſts*
'reſorting to great Confluxes of Water, or of *Philip* and
'the *Eunuch*'s going down into this, were it not that
'the Baptiſm both of the one and the other, was to be
'performed by an *Immerſion?* A very little Water, as
'we know it doth with us, ſufficing for an *Effuſion* or
'*Sprinkling*. But beſides the Words of our bleſſed Sa-
'viour, and the concurrent Practice of thoſe Times,
'wherein this *Sacrament was inſtituted*, it is in my Opi-
'nion of no leſs Conſideration, that the *Thing* ſignified
'by the Sacrament of Baptiſm, cannot otherwiſe be well
'repreſented, than by an *Immerſion*, or at leaſt by ſome
'more general Way of Purification, than that of *Effuſion*
'or *Sprinkling*. For tho' pouring or ſprinkling of a little
'Water upon the Face, may ſuffice to repreſent an inter-
'nal Waſhing, which ſeems to be the general End of
'Chriſt's making Uſe of the Sacrament of Baptiſm, yet
'can it not be thought to repreſent ſuch an *entire* Waſh-
'ing as that of *new-born* Infants was, and as Baptiſm
'ſeems to be intended for; becauſe repreſented as the
'*Laver of our Regeneration:* That, tho' it do not re-
'quire an Immerſion, yet requiring ſuch a general
'Waſhing at leaſt, as may extend to the *whole* Body,
'as other than which cannot anſwer its Type, nor yet
'that general, tho' internal Purgation which Baptiſm
'was intended to repreſent. The ſame is to be ſaid yet
'more upon the Account of our conforming to the
'Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, which we learn
'from St. *Paul*, to have been the *Deſign* of Baptiſm to
'ſignify. For tho' that might be, and was well enough
'repreſented by the baptized Perſon's being *buried in*
'*Baptiſm*, and then *riſing* out of it; yet can it not be
'ſaid to be ſo, or at leaſt but *very imperfectly*, by the
'bare pouring out, or ſprinkling the baptiſmal Water on
'him: But therefore, as there is ſo much the more

Reaſon

'Reaſon to repreſent the Rite of *Immerſion*, as the ONLY 'LEGITIMATE RITE of Baptiſm, becauſe the ONLY 'ONE that can anſwer the *Ends of its Inſtitution*, and 'thoſe Things which were to be *ſignified* by it; ſo eſpe-'cially if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of great 'Force) the *general Practice* of the primitive Church 'was agreeable thereto, and the Practice of the *Greek* 'Church to this very Day. For who can think either 'the one or the other would have been ſo tenacious of ſo 'troubleſome a Rite, were it not, that they were well 'aſſured, as they of the primitive Church might very 'well be, of its being the ONLY INSTITUTED and 'LEGITIMATE ONE?'

Tolerable good *Conceſſions*, conſidering they come from the Pens of thoſe who practiſed Sprinkling. To theſe I might add a Cloud of Witneſſes, which teſtify the ſame Thing, in Favour of what we profeſs, reſpecting the *ancient* and *ſcriptural Mode* of *Baptizing*; but ſhall content my ſelf at preſent, with only citing the Words of Dr. *Whitby*, in his *Paraphraſe* and *Commentary* on the *New Teſtament*, who thus expreſſes himſelf on *Rom.* vi. -- *We are buried with him in Baptiſm.* 'It being expreſsly 'declared here, and *Col.* ii. 12. That we are buried with 'Chriſt in Baptiſm, by being buried under Water; and 'the Argument to oblige us to a Conformity to his 'Death by dying to Sin, being taken hence; and this '*Immerſion* being religiouſly obſerved by *all Chriſtians* for '*thirteen Centuries*, and approved by our Church, and 'the CHANGE of it into SPRINKLING, even with-'out *any Allowance* from the Author of this INSTITU-'TION, or any Licence from any Council of the *Church*, 'being that which the *Romaniſt* ſtill urgeth, to juſtify 'his Refuſal of the Cup to the Laity; it were to be 'wiſhed that this Cuſtom might be again of general 'Uſe.'

And as Dr. *Gale* ſays, *What follows concerning Aſperſion, being not to the Purpoſe, I omit it.*

Let us now attend on Mr. *F.* to hear what he has to *object* againſt us, on this Head.

1. Says he, *Sacraments are not natural but arbitrary Signs.*

Signs. *Anſ.* I cannot but wonder what Advantage he thinks to gain to his Cauſe by this Obſervation! For is it not allowed by all, that there is always an Analogy or Reſemblance betwixt the *Signs* and the *Things ſignified*? Otherwiſe how ſhould the Signs lead us to the Things ſignified, or be helpful to our Faith in thoſe Things? As all ſacramental Signs are appointed of God, ſo alſo what they ſhould ſignify: We are not of our own Heads to imagine this or the other to be ſignified by them, and then adapt the Signs to the Things ſuppoſed to be ſignified, different from their firſt Inſtitution. Thus in the Caſe before us: Baptiſm no way anſwers with what the Apoſtle here ſets forth, but by Immerſion; and it ſeems Mr. *F.* ſaw this, when he aſks us, why muſt Signs bear ſuch a *natural Reſemblance* of the Things by them ſignified? intimating, that burying the Party in Baptiſm, and his Riſing up again, hath a very *natural*, lively and ſuitable Reſemblance of the Burial and Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, and of our dying to Sin, and riſing again to walk in Newneſs of Life; but was willing to turn it aſide by ſome Artifice or another. Sacramental Signs are *Arbitrary* with Reſpect to the good Will and Pleaſure of their Inſtitutor; but it does not therefore follow, they bear not a *natural Reſemblance* of the Things ſignified by them; nay the contrary is manifeſt, whatever Mr. *F.* may think proper to object againſt it.

2. 'But further (ſays our Author) we are alſo ſaid by 'Baptiſm *to be planted together in the Likeneſs of Chriſt's* 'Death. Now he died hanging on the Croſs; muſt we 'therefore be fix'd on a Croſs when baptized, that ſo 'there may be a natural Reſemblance?

Anſ. The Aſſembly of Divines, in their Annotation on *Rom.* vi. 5. very beautifully and pertinently refute this *ſneering* Objection: *Planted together*; they ſay, 'By 'this elegant Similitude, the Apoſtle repreſenteth unto 'us, that as Plants engraffed, receive Moiſture and Juice 'from the Stock, whereby they ſprout out, and bear 'Fruit; ſo we receive Vigour from Chriſt, whereby we 'live ſpiritually, and bear the Fruit of good Works: 'And as a Plant that is ſet in the Earth, lyeth as dead

and

'and unmovable for a Time, but after ſprings up and 'flouriſheth; ſo Chriſt's Body lay dead for a while in the 'Grave, but ſprung up and reflouriſhed in his Reſur-'rection: *And we alſo, when we are baptized, are buried 'as it were in Water for a Time, but after are raiſed up 'to Newneſs of Life.*'

In the following Paragraph, I think there are two or three Objections thrown up together: 1. That we ſhould prove that Dipping was then uſed. 2. That the Apoſtle uſed it; and 3. That he approved it. As to the *Firſt*, 'tis already proven, and confirmed by the joint Conſent of divers Teſtimonies of Pædo-baptiſts themſelves. 2dly, we have abundant Reaſon to conclude the Apoſtle uſed it, becauſe he ſets himſelf in with others *who were buried with Chriſt by Baptiſm.* Rom. 6. and 3. That he approved of Immerſion; becauſe he puts the *Roman* and *Coloſſian* Chriſtians in Mind of their Baptiſm, thereby to promote their dying to Sin, and riſing to Newneſs of Life; which was ſo clearly and ſuitably repreſented, when they were buried with Chriſt therein.

Says he, 'If an Alluſion to a Practice will prove the 'Approbation and Uſe of it, then we can prove that the 'ſame Apoſtle both uſed and approved the Olympick 'Games.' *Anſ.* We don't ſay it will. But does Mr. *F.* think this to be a parallel Caſe? Were the Olympick Games ordain'd of God? Did Chriſt authoriſe them? Does the Apoſtle ſay, that himſelf and other Believers *acted* in them? Does he any where intimate theſe were deſign'd to repreſent a Death to Sin, *&c.?* No, not at all; what then is this brought for, but to blindfold the unwary Reader?

'But for my Part (ſays he) I do not believe the Apo-'ſtle alludes to the Mode of Dipping, in the Expreſſions 'of being buried and riſen with Chriſt in Baptiſm.' *Anſ.* And what of that? why, his Unbelief can't make the Word of God to be of none Effect, tho' it may harden ſome others in their like Unbelief along with him. 'Tis added, 'any more than I believe that he alludes to 'ſome Cuſtom of Chriſtians being faſtened to a Croſs in 'Baptiſm by thoſe other Expreſſions, of being planted

'together

'together in the Likeneſs of his Death; for I can ſee 'no more Reaſon for believing the one than the other, 'and the one PRACTICE is without Proof as much as 'the other.' *Anſ.* Were there any ſuch *Chriſtians* (as Mr. *F.* calls them) who uſed to faſten People to a Croſs in Baptiſm, in the Apoſtles Days? Or does he read in Scripture, of any Thing in the Circumſtances of Baptiſm, that inclines him to think there is as much Reaſon for believing the one as the other? What a Stock of Aſſurance is here diſcovered, when he tells us, That the *Practice* of Dipping Perſons in Baptiſm, is without Proof, as much as faſtening them to a Croſs in Baptiſm! I think it is hardly worth any Man's while to argue with one, who won't ſtick to utter ſuch undigeſted Thoughts, in Defence of his Cauſe, when they come in his Way! If the Caſe be as Mr. *F.* affirms, what ſignifies our Bibles to us, or that we ſhould be told that *John* baptized the Multitudes in the River of *Jordan*, and that Chriſt, after he was baptized in *Jordan*, ſtraightway came up out of the Water, *&c.* But let the candid Reader judge if there is not a great deal more Proof for Immerſion, than there is for faſtening People to a Croſs in Baptiſm, when there is not the leaſt Intimation of the latter, in all the Paſſages which ſpeak of Baptiſm.

If the Caſe be as Mr. *F.* aſſerts, How came ſuch a great Body of eminent Divines to be ſo miſtaken in this Matter? Reaſon tells us, that there muſt be not only a mere Probability, but ſome very great Certainty in the Caſe, before thoſe who practis'd *Sprinkling*, would confeſs that *Dipping* was the ancient Mode of Baptizing, contrary to their own *Practice*. Beſides Mr. *F.* would do well to conſider, that he has not given us one Inſtance where *Baptizo* is rendred, or ſignifies to pour or ſprinkle.

He proceeds to account for the Apoſtle's uſing ſuch figurative Expreſſions, and tells us, 'That Chriſt being 'the Covenant Head, and Repreſentative of his Elect, 'they are ſaid to do and ſuffer, what he did and ſuffered 'in their ſtead, becauſe repreſented by him, and have 'Communion in the Benefits of his Obedience and Suf-'ferings; therefore they are ſaid to be crucified with 'Chriſt, to be dead with him, and buried and riſen with

'him, yea and to ſit with him in heavenly Places.'

Anſ. The Death, Burial, and Reſurrection of Chriſt, together with our Death to Sin, and Reſurrection to Newneſs of Life, are the great Things which we affirm to be ſignified by Baptiſm: Now we ſee in theſe fore cited Places, how beautifully theſe Things are ſet forth in the Sign; *Buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, wherein alſo you are riſen with him through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raiſed him from the Dead.* Mr. *F.* muſt either deny that the Apoſtle meant Water Baptiſm in this Place, or elſe be forc'd to *ſhuffle* and *twiſt* to evade the Force of his Words, which hold forth a ſymbolical, or baptiſmal Burial, and baptiſmal Riſing; or elſe it could not be ſaid, buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm -which cannot be but by dipping the Party into Water, and riſing up again: *Buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, wherein alſo you are riſen with him:* Theſe Expreſſions of the holy Apoſtle, being ſo perfectly agreeable with the Practice of *John*, who baptized Perſons in the River *Jordan*, and in *Enon*, where there was much Water; being alſo confirmed by the beautiful and illuſtrious Example of our adored LORD and *Saviour* JESUS CHRIST, who was baptized himſelf in *Jordan*, do ſufficiently refute the Objections of our Opponents, and fully confirm our Faith in this Point, That Immerſion, and no other, is the only proper Scriptural Mode of Baptiſm. We are alſo confident, tho' God ſuffers his Truth to be long deſpiſed, and treated by many with Contempt and Diſdain, that yet in his own due Time, he will ariſe, and plead his own Cauſe, to the Joy and Satisfaction of all his People.

Mr. *F.* may ſee briefly our *Grounds* for our Faith and Practice; and if we are guilty, as he charges us, of excluding the Proteſtant Churches on theſe Grounds, let him anſwer us in this Point, whether it be our Duty to conform to the Practice of thoſe Churches, who hold *Sprinkling* to be Baptiſm, or to the Word of God, which holds forth Immerſion to be the proper Mode of adminiſtring this holy Ordinance.

Having proven the Mode of Baptiſm, from the Signification of the Word *Baptizo*, from the Practice of the primitive Times, or Scripture Examples, and from Scripture

Scripture Alluſions, to be *Immerſion* ; and withal, refuted Mr. *F*'s Objections againſt it ; I need to be but very brief in Remarking on what follows.

His ſecond Aſſertion is, ' That the Scriptures afford ' clearer Grounds to us, in Favour of our Mode of Bap- ' tiſm, than to our Opponents againſt it.' Say you ſo ? Then pray let us examine thoſe Grounds : 1ſt, ' It ' ſeems to be propheſied of in *Iſa.* lii. 15. *He ſhall ſprin- ' kle many Nations.* I don't ſee one ſolid Reaſon that can ' be advanc'd againſt our referring it to the Water of ' Baptiſm, as well as to the Blood of Chriſt, and the ' Doctrine of the Goſpel.' *Reply.* I remember he informs us at the Beginning, that he intended his *Performance* for the Uſe of the *Common People* ; and truly they muſt be ſuch, and of whoſe Intellectuals he has no Reaſon to think any Thing but what is mean and contemptible, or elſe that they are already fully prepoſſeſs'd with his Opinion, who will believe that this Text affords a *clearer Ground* for Sprinkling in Baptiſm, than the Places I have quoted do for *Immerſion.* The Folly and Impertinency of our Opponents in citing this Place, with this Intent, can't be ſufficiently *detected:* ‡ A Text that hath no Manner of Relation to the Mode of Baptiſm ; nor any where referred to in all the New-Teſtament, on ſuch an Occaſion. Let Mr. *F.* ſhew us the Place if he can, which proves that this was fulfilled, by ſprinkling the Nations with Water, as he ſuggeſts ; or ceaſe to miſguide the *Common People*, by wreſting and ſtraining Texts of Scripture, to ſerve his Purpoſe. In a Word, I can't but fully agree with the *Reverend* and *Judicious* Mr. *Gill*, * ſaying, ' Who in the World could ever ' imagine, that the Ordinance of Water-baptiſm, with ' the Mode of its Adminiſtration, ſhould be intended ' here ? A Man muſt have his Imagination prodigiouſly ' heated indeed, and his Mind captivated with a mere ' Jingle of Words, that can look upon ſuch *Proofs* as ' theſe, fecht out of the Old Teſtament, as demonſtra- ' tive Ones of the *true* Mode of *Baptizing* under the ' New.

‡ Vid. Mr. Dickinſon's Doct. of Regeneration vind. p. 40 41.— * Defence of the ancient Mode of Baptizing, p. 18.

'2*dly*, The Scriptures give us Examples of ſeveral 'Perſons who ſeem to have been baptized by Pouring 'or Sprinkling, more probably than by Dipping, as the 'three Thouſand in *Acts* ii. 41.' *Anſ.* But is there not a far greater Probability that the three Thouſand were baptized by Immerſion according to the Meaning of the Word, and after the ſame Manner that others were, of whom we have a fuller Account than is here given? The Arguments raiſed in Favour of *Sprinkling* from this Text, are very inconſiderable, and too weak by far to bear the Streſs laid upon them; for there is nothing appears to the Contrary, but the *Seventy* Diſciples were there together with the twelve Apoſtles--- ſeeing *the Number of Names together were about an Hundred and Twenty*, *Acts* i. 15. And theſe were together at the Day of *Pentecoſt*, *Acts* ii. 1. Hence it appears not, but there were Adminiſtrators ſufficient to diſpatch the Work in a little Time. As to any further Objections thrown in the Way, they are either anſwered already, or carry in them no Weight worth any One's while to make any Remarks on them.

'Again (ſays he) *Cornelius* and his Company afford 'us a good Argument, *Acts* x. 47. *Peter*'s Words are 'memorable, *Can any forbid Water, that theſe ſhould not 'be baptized?* He does not ſay, Can any hinder to go 'to a Water, but, *Can any forbid Water?* which is an 'Intimation that Water was to be brought.' *Anſ.* Here is nothing in this Inſtance neither, that *demonſtrates* that *Cornelius* and his Company were *ſprinkled*; for thoſe Places of Scripture which do but juſt mention *any Thing*, are to be interpreted by others, which ſpeak more clear and full of the *ſame Thing*; An *Inſtance* of this we have before us, Verſe 48, compared with *Acts* xix. 5. *He commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord (Jeſus)* May one hence conclude, becauſe the Father and Holy Ghoſt are not mention'd, that therefore theſe Perſons were not baptized in the Name of the Father and Holy Ghoſt, according to *Mat.* xxviii. 19. but in the Name of the Son only? Not at all. So neither can any one conclude, that they had the Ordinance adminiſtred unto them in any other *Manner*, than according to the

plain

plain and *full* Account given of this *Matter*, in other Places of the Holy Scripture, *viz.* by *Immerſion*, or *being buried in Baptiſm.*

Mr. *F.* ſays, 'All Circumſtances concur to ſhew that 'Saul or *Paul* was not plung'd, *Acts* ix. 18, 19. He re-'ceived Sight, aroſe, and was baptized, received Meat 'and was ſtrengthned, all ſeems to have been done in 'the Place where *Ananias* found him, *viz.* in the Houſe 'of *Judas* of *Damaſcus.*' *Anſ.* There is a very good Circumſtance to conclude from, that *Paul* was not ſprinkled; becauſe 'tis expreſly ſaid, he AROSE, and was *baptized*: Now if the Ordinance had been adminiſtred by *Pouring* or *Sprinkling*, there appears no Neceſſity for his *moving* or *riſing* from the Place where he *ſat* or *lay*: But what puts the Matter out of Doubt is, that the Apoſtle *Paul* puts himſelf in with others, who *are buried with Chriſt by Baptiſm*, Rom. vi 4.

'Again in *Acts* xvi. 33. the Jaylor and his Houſe 'were baptized after Midnight; nor have we any Rea-'ſon to ſuppoſe they all went out of the City, nor yet 'out of the Houſe for Water to plunge in; but rather 'were there baptized, where they were converted, and 'that by *Pouring* or *Sprinkling*. *Reply.* How Mr. *F.* can allow himſelf the Liberty to argue after the Manner he does, from the *Paſſage* concerning the Jaylor's Baptiſm, as if he had been ſprinkled in his Houſe, I can't tell: For when we look into it, there is nothing therein that favours ſuch a Notion, but quite the Contrary: For, 1ſt, The Jaylor brought *Paul* and *Silas* out of Priſon, Verſe 30. and 'tis very probable that he took them into his Houſe, becauſe *they ſpake unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his Houſe.* 2*dly*, The Jaylor and his Houſhold, were not baptized in the *Priſon*, nor in his *Houſe*; for after he and his Houſhold were baptized, 'tis very expreſs, that *he brought Paul* and *Silas into his Houſe.* All Circumſtances being duly conſidered, do abundantly refute what our Opponents urge from this *Paſſage*, in Favour of *Sprinkling.*

Having gone through in examining the Places, which Mr. *F.* has advanced to prove Sprinkling to be the *right Mode* of Baptiſm; I find there does not appear any Thing

of Force or Weight, to countenance that Practice; there is not one Inſtance from Scripture, brought to us to confirm it; nor any Conſequence ſufficient to ſupport the Belief of a ſeeking Perſon, that Baptiſm was ſo adminiſtred; yet Mr. *F.* has the *Vanity* to ſay, that *they out-do us even in Scripture Examples*; when, in the mean Time, he has not produc'd one *Example* of any Perſon's being *ſprinkled*---But we read of Multitudes who were baptized in the *River Jordan*; and amongſt others, our bleſſed Saviour; *who left us an Example, that we ſhould follow his Steps.* I find alſo, that Mr. *F.* is not certain of it himſelf, that thoſe Perſons he refers to were ſprinkled, only *that it is much more probable that they were ſprinkled than dipt*; which cannot be, unleſs we had plainer Circumſtances and Evidences in Favour of Sprinkling, than we have of Dipping, or overwhelming; which we find not. It is therefore not only probable, but certain, that Baptiſm was adminiſtred to them, after the ſame Manner it was to Chriſt himſelf, and Multitudes of others, *viz.* by *Immerſion.* I do therefore very freely appeal to the Judgment of any Reader, who is not *reſolved* to hold Sprinkling to be the true Mode of Baptizing, right or wrong, whether Mr. *F.* hath made good his Aſſertion, *viz.* That he has *clearer* Grounds from Scripture for Sprinkling, than we have for Dipping, in Baptiſm? when he has not given any Inſtances of it, as we have of Perſons who were formerly *buried* in Baptiſm; and 'tis therefore to be adminiſtred by Immerſion ſtill, wherein they ariſe to walk in Newneſs of Life. People ought alſo to conſider that the Ways and Appointments of God, are not to be chang'd and alter'd by Men, according to their Fancies and Inclinations; even tho' good Men ſhould do ſo, or practiſe what is not according to the original *Pattern* (as in the Caſe of *Sprinkling* inſtead of *Dipping*) they are in that not to be followed, nor depended upon: 'Tis every One's Duty to ſearch the Scripture, to know who are the Subjects, and what is the Mode of Baptiſm, and practiſe accordingly.

Mr. *F.*, tells us, 'If the Scriptures do ſpeak leſs expreſly of this Point, it is to teach us, that a peculiar 'Mode is not eſſential to the Ordinance, as our Oppo-

'nents

'nents fondly imagine it to be.' Finely ſpoken! If a peculiar Mode is not eſſential to this Ordinance, how come Mr. *F.* to aſſert, that Baptiſm is *rightly* adminiſtred by pouring or ſprinkling Water upon the Perſon baptized? And what makes him ſo ſtrenuous in Vindication of Sprinkling, if Baptiſm may be adminiſtred either Way, or any Way? And what Colour of Reaſon can our Opponents have for their Endeavours to expoſe us to the World, by their baſe Inſinuations that *Immerſion* is *undecent*, *immodeſt*, and tends to *Murder* and *Adultery*, if it is an indifferent Thing which Way the Ordinance is adminiſtred? Our Mode is certainly right, according to their own Way of Arguing. I look on this Paſſage now before me, to be an Evidence of what we profeſs to be the Truth; for had it been otherwiſe, I doubt not but Mr. *F.* would readily affirm Sprinkling to be the *only peculiar* Mode of Baptiſm: But by inſinuating the Caſe to be doubtful (which is the Method in general of thoſe who would either introduce, or countenance Falſhood) he might, the leſs ſuſpected, *plentifully* fling his Dirt upon, and *ſtrenuouſly* oppoſe the *Scriptural* Mode of Baptizing; and labour, at the ſame Time, to eſtabliſh his Practice to be the only proper Mode of Baptiſm. But can any Man who reads the Scripture, think there is no Matter how Baptiſm is done; and conclude with Mr. *F. that it is enough if it be done with Water*; but no Matter how the Water is uſed, or to what Part of the Body it be applied? Whatever Mr. *F.* (or any other) may think, we are ſure God never *inſtituted* any Ordinance to be carried on juſt as Mens changeable Fancies, and different Notions, might happen to lead them, in the Adminiſtration of it; for if he had, it would be to open a Door to endleſs Diſcords, Variance and Confuſions, amongſt his Creatures, and no Rule or Standard left them ever to convince each other, or to decide their unavoidable and remedileſs Controverſies, and Differences; which a God of ORDER, never did.

Now ſeeing Mr. *Finley*'s Aſſertion natively leads to ſuch Abſurdities, the Truth is, That ſome peculiar Mode is eſſential to Baptiſm; and by all that has yet appeared, that Mode is *Immerſion*, or *Dipping*: Therefore our

pleading for it, does in Juſtice deſerve a better Name, than *fond Imagination*. Further, Why ſhould it be urg'd that a proper Subject is eſſential to Baptiſm, but a proper peculiar Mode not eſſential? Can any one ſee the Reaſon why the former ſhould be ſo, but not the latter? When both are ſufficiently revealed in Scripture, equally plain to any one who will not thro' Prejudice, or ſuch like, ſhut his Eyes againſt an evident Truth. And,

Tho' it may not be very *reliſhing* to the Palates of our Opponents, yet we are not afraid to tell them, that when they *ſprinkle* an *Infant*, they obſerve neither the proper Mode, nor have the proper Subject of Baptiſm; and 'tis but uſing the Name of the *adorable* TRINITY in a Way never appointed by God, which can be nothing ſhort of taking his Holy Name in vain.

Says he, 'As to the Quantity of Water, we are told 'no more of it, than how much Bread and Wine ſhall 'be uſed in the other Sacrament.'

Anſ. As in the *Lord's Supper* ſo much *Bread* and *Wine* is neceſſary, as will anſwer to the ſacramental Actions of Eating and Drinking; ſo in Baptiſm, there is a Neceſſity of ſo much Water as will be ſufficient to *cover the Perſon* in; for *John* was baptizing in *Enon*, *becauſe there was much Water there.*

3*dly*, Says our Author, 'Our Mode fully anſwers the 'Ends of Baptiſm, and is moſt ſuitable and ſignificant.' *Reply*, God will have the *Manner* to be obſerved, as well as the *End*; as we ſee in that Inſtance of his Diſpleaſure againſt *Iſrael*, when they were about to bring home the Ark upon a Cart; *Uzza* indeed was ſmitten for his own Error; but that was not all, for that ſore Diſaſter affected the Congregation; and *David* underſtood by that Stroke, that they were wrong in the *Manner* of carrying the Ark upon a *Cart*, whereas it ought to have been brought on the Shoulders of the *Prieſts* and *Levites*. 1 *Chron.* xv. 13. *For becauſe ye did it not at the Firſt, the Lord our God made a Breach upon us, for that we ſought him not after the* DUE ORDER.

Might they not as well argue then, if the Ark was brought home, what Matter which Way it *was done*, if it *anſwers the End*; juſt as our Opponents now do, that

Sprinkling

Sprinkling anſwers the Ends of Baptiſm? But when the Lord hath *ordered* otherwiſe, that Mode only is moſt ſuitable and ſignificant, which is according to his reveal-ed Will and Appointment: Regard alſo muſt be had to the *due Order* or Manner of our Obedience to God in any Ordinance, as well as to the Ends of it; otherwiſe Perſons (even gracious) expoſe themſelves to the ſmart-ing Corrections of God's Hand, for their *Diſregard* of his poſitive Inſtitutions, or *Neglect* of obſerving the *due Order* required in ſubmitting to them. A few Drops of Water wont ſerve in the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, when Immerſion is proven to be the Mode according to the Word of God; and *allowed* by many Pædo-baptiſt Authors, to be the Way of Baptizing in Apoſtolic Times: Seeing the Ordinance is deſign'd to repreſent the Burial and Reſurrection of Chriſt, and our Death to Sin, and Riſing to Newneſs of Life; theſe Ends can't be anſwered, but by Immerſion; *buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm.*

'That Mode is moſt ſuitable, which can be practiſed 'without Danger of Health in any Time of the Year, 'without Immodeſty or Indecency to any Perſon, be-'fore any Company, upon any Occaſion, or in any 'Place where Conveniency requires.' *Anſ.* It was a great Part of *Jeroboam*'s Politicks, to ſecure the People in his Intereſt, by telling them, *It is too much for you to go up to Jeruſalem* *. q. d. *You need not endanger your Lives and Healths, by ſuch fatiguing Journeys and Travels, 'tis too much for you--ſee here is an eaſy Method and Way of Worſhip for you.*-- Pray what does Mr. *F.* mean by his Inſinuation that Dipping is dangerous, and prejudicial to People's Healths? unleſs he had given Inſtances of Per-ſons whoſe Health had been injur'd by it; but this he has not, and I'm perſuaded cannot: 'Tis nothing therefore but a mere *Bugbear*, to fright his Admirers from giving due Obedience to Jeſus Chriſt, in this ſacred Ordi-nance: And hereby he labours to continue an *eaſy* (but falſe) *Way*, in direct Oppoſition to the *beautiful* Way appointed of God. I may here add what Mr. *Gill* † ſays on the like Occaſion, 'If it is the Duty of Perſons 'to

* 1 Kings xii. 28. † Antient Mode of Baptizing, pag. 75.

'to be baptized, it is their Duty to be plunged; for 'there is no true Baptiſm without it? But what, in 'the Depth of Winter? Why not? What Damage 'is like to come by it? Our Climate is not near ſo 'cold as *Muſcovy*, where they always dip their Infants 'in Baptiſm, to this very Day; as does alſo the *Greek* 'Church in all Parts of the World. But what, plunge 'Perſons when under Conſumptions, Catarrhs, *&c?* 'Why not? Perhaps it may be of Uſe to them, for the 'Reſtoration of Health; and its being performed on a 'ſacred Account, can never be any Hindrance to it. 'Whoever reads Sir *John Floyer*'s *Hiſtory of Cold Bath-* 'ing, and the many Cures that have been performed 'thereby, which he there relates, will never think that 'this is a ſufficient Objection againſt Plunging in Bap- 'tiſm; which learned Phyſician, has alſo of late pub- 'liſhed *An Eſſay to reſtore the Dipping of Infants in their* 'Baptiſm; which he argues for, not only from the Signi- 'fication of Baptiſm, and its Theological End, but 'likewiſe from the Medicinal Uſe of Dipping, for pre- 'venting and curing many Diſtempers. If it may be 'uſeful for the Health of tender Infants, and is in many 'Caſes now made Uſe of, it can never be prejudicial to 'grown Perſons. He argues from the Liturgy and Ru- 'brick of the Church of *England*, which requires *Dip-* 'ping in Baptiſm, and only allows *pouring of Water* in 'Caſe of Weakneſs, and never ſo much as granted a 'Permiſſion for *Sprinkling*. He proves in this Book, 'and more largely in his Former, that the conſtant 'Practice of the Church of *England*, ever ſince the Plan- 'tation of Chriſtianity, was to dip or plunge in Bap- 'tiſm; which he ſays continued after the Reformation, 'until King *Edward* the Sixth's Time, and after: Nay, 'that its Diſuſe has been within this Hundred Years. 'And here I can't forbear mentioning a Paſſage of his, 'to this Purpoſe, Our Fonts are built (ſays he) with a 'ſufficient Capacity for dipping of Infants, and they 'have been ſo uſed for Five Hundred Years in *England*, 'both Kings and common People have been dipped; 'but now our *Fonts* ſtand in our Churches as Monu-

ments,

'ments, to upbraid us with our Change or Neglect of 'our baptiſmal *Immerſion*. And I wiſh he had not Rea-'ſon to ſay as he does, that Sprinkling was firſt introduc'd 'by the Aſſembly of Divines in 1643, by a Vote of 25 'againſt 24, and eſtabliſh'd by an *Ordinance* of *Parlia-'ment* in 1644.'

As to Mr. *F*'s Suggeſtion, *that Dipping is immodeſt and indecent*; it muſt be only for want of better Argument; for if he has ever ſeen the Ordinance adminiſtred, he muſt acknowledge it was done with all Modeſty and Decency becoming the Solemnity; if not, he ſhould not be ſo ready to take up an Ill-report againſt his Neighbours, and ſpread it abroad upon hear-ſay, from ſome malicious and ill-diſpoſed Perſons, who are not backward to reproach the moſt decent and modeſt Acts of religious Worſhip, at their Pleaſure.

'4*thly*, That the Mode which our Opponents contend 'for, is loaded with Inconvenience, and chargeable 'with Abſurdities.'

What are they? Why,

'They either dip Perſons naked, or not naked: If 'naked, 'tis evidently immodeſt, an Incentive to Un-'cleanneſs, and a manifeſt Violation of the Seventh 'Command; if not naked, then they chiefly baptize only 'the Clothes, and do no more than ſoak the Body.'

Anſ. I appeal to any modeſt impartial Perſon, whether Mr. *F.* hath not given more juſt Occaſion to defile People's Minds, by this vain and impertinent Way of Talking, than ever we have given by adminiſtring Baptiſm by Immerſion? But ſays he, if we baptize People in their Clothes, we chiefly baptize only the Clothes, and do no more than ſoak the Body. A mighty Inconveniency ſure! Juſt as if baptizing a clothed Body in Water, was not baptizing the Body! As if a Body could not be ſaid to be buried in the Earth, unleſs it was buried naked! Rare Diſcoveries! Whatever he may imagine to gain by ſuch Kind of Reaſoning, we can aſſure him, we don't yet feel the Force of his ſuppoſed Inconveniency, or Abſurdity, pinching us.

'Either the Miniſter himſelf dips the whole Body, or 'only a part of it.'---All that Mr. *F.* advanceth on this Head,

Head, is ſoon refuted, by the Inſtance of the Eunuch's Baptiſm; who was not carried, but went himſelf into the Water; yet his going into the Water was no Part of his Baptiſm, for he was wholly dipt by *Philip*.

Hence the Strength of this *Dilemma* or horned Argument, is not like to turn us back from following the Scriptural Mode of Baptizing; for we find the Horns are not made of *Iron* as *Zedekiah*'s ‡ were, but of *human, feeble Devices*, which will not ſtand a *Touch* in Battle, againſt the invincible Word of God, *Pro.* xxi. 30. *Iſa.* viii. 9, 10. If Mr. *F.* would be found to act agreeable with the Practice in Apoſtolical Times, he ſhould go with the Party to be baptized, or dipt, into the Water too; and not call for a Baſon of Water to be brought into a Meeting-houſe, or elſewhere, in order to ſprinkle a few Drops on the Perſons Face; which Practice hath no *Precedent* in the Word of God.

'Either they baptize Perſons whenever they make 'a credible and ſatisfactory Profeſſion of their Faith, and 'earneſtly deſire Baptiſm, or they do not.' *Anſ.* Our Antagoniſt would fain find ſomething here, that he may infer Baptizing or Dipping to be a Breach of the Sixth Command; and accordingly conjectures and ſuppoſes divers Things which may fall out, as that *a Perſon may be converted in the Depth of Winter.* Well if he is, and deſires Baptiſm, he may be baptized, as many others have been heretofore in cold Weather, without any Hurt or Injury to the Baptizer or Baptized. This is not all, *one may be taken ſick with a dangerous Diſeaſe, the Pleuriſy, Flux, Small-pox*, &c. *and is then brought to believe in Chriſt, and convinced he ought to be baptized:* Well, what of that? *Why if Baptiſm is deny'd, God is diſobey'd; If he be plung'd, he will be kill'd.* I doubt not but ſuch kind of Reaſonings, are maſterly Strokes in our Author's Account; but before they will be of much Service to him, Mr. *F.* ſhould ſpeak out, *That Baptiſm is abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation; or if the ſick Perſon ſhould die unbaptized, he would be certainly damn'd*; and not mince the Matter; for then we ſhould know more certainly, whether we muſt anſwer him as a *Proteſtant*, or a *Papiſt*.

If

‡ 1 Kings xxii. 11.

If he ſays 'tis not abſolutely neceſſary, then, in ſuch Circumſtances, it can be neither Diſobedience to God, nor injurious to the ſick Perſon, to defer his Baptiſm (if he recovers) till ſuch Time as he is capable to give Obedience to God therein. Let Mr. *F.* try how his Argument here, will ſuit with his own Practice; ſuppoſe a gracious Perſon to be ſick of ſuch Diſeaſes, and one who not at all, or for ſome great while paſt, has not received the Sacrament of the Supper; but in his Sickneſs earneſtly deſires to partake of it (for ſuch a Thing hath been to my certain Knowledge) would he adminiſter the Supper to that ſick Perſon, or is it cuſtomary for him to do ſo? I believe not. Why then ſhould it be charg'd as an Inconveniency or Abſurdity on us, for not adminiſtring Baptiſm on ſuch an Occaſion? Why is the one Sacrament more neceſſary to ſick Perſons than the other? Or if one may be deferred till convenient Time, why not the other? Let him give us ſomething like a ſolid and ſubſtantial Reaſon of the Difference in the Caſe, why Baptiſm muſt be adminiſtred to a ſick Perſon who deſires it, but the Lord's Supper muſt not, tho' he deſires it ever ſo much? And when we have his Anſwer to this Queſtion, we may, if need be, ſpeak more to the Point: In the mean Time, the Heap of Abſurdities this Gentleman would willingly throw upon the Truth we profeſs, do ſlide clean off; for in *Proteſtant* Language we'll venture to ſay, ‡ — 'The want of the Sacraments doth not hurt, 'when with CONVENIENCY a Man cannot enjoy 'them, but the Contempt or Neglect of them when they 'may *conveniently* be come unto.'

Says our Author, 'Seeing the Scriptures afford neither 'Precept, nor ſo much as one undoubted Example of 'Baptizing by Plunging, can it be thought leſs than an 'Abſurdity to make that Mode of Adminiſtration eſſen-'tial to the Ordinance, ſo as nothing elſe can be Bap-'tiſm. The Reader may ſee how little they are favour-'ed by the Etimology of the Word *Baptizo*, by Scripture 'Examples, or by Scripture Alluſions; and ſo may judge 'how Eſſential to Baptiſm, Dipping is.' *Anſ.* There is no *Reader* who acts like a Man, will judge any Caſe, before

‡ Arch-bp. Uſher's Body of Div. p. 404.

fore he has heard and weighed both Sides: And here he will find that the *Learned* conſtantly affirm that *Baptizo natively* and *properly* ſignifies to *dip* or *plunge*. Let him alſo obſerve, that Mr. *F.* has not given him one Inſtance, where the Word is render'd, or ſignifies *to pour* or *ſprinkle*. The judicious Reader is further deſired to obſerve, that we have the Commiſſion of our LORD to baptize (i. e. to dip) Believers; but there is no Commiſſion to *ſprinkle Infants*. That *John* baptized Perſons in the River *Jordan*, and in *Ænon*; that *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went both down into the Water to celebrate this holy Ordinance: But not one ſingle Inſtance of any one Perſon *ſprinkled* in an Houſe; nor any neceſſary Conſequence to conclude that any were: That the Apoſtle *Paul* ſpeaks of whole Churches being buried by, or in Baptiſm, which cannot be true but by dipping Perſons in Water, when the Ordinance is adminiſtred. Upon the whole, let the Reader judge which is the *good* old Way of Baptizing marked out in Scripture, and follow it accordingly.

'Laſtly, it ſeems to me no ſmall Abſurdity to exclude 'and unchriſtian all the other Proteſtant Churches on the 'Account of this Mode.' *Anſ.* What an odd Way has Mr. *F.* got of repreſenting Things! When did he ever hear any of us ſay that there were no Chriſtians in other Denominations? Or how is it poſſible we ſhould unchriſtian them, when according to our Principles, we do not adminiſter Baptiſm to any, but to thoſe, who in the Judgment of Charity, are look'd upon to be Chriſtians? Does he think Infant-Baptiſm to be Eſſential to Chriſtianity, when he talks at this Rate? That if we deny the one, we exclude the other. Does a Society unchriſtian all others with whom it cannot or doth not hold Community? If ſo, the Preſbyterian Society unchriſtians all other Communities with whom it cannot, or does not hold Communion. 'Tis then high Time for Mr. *F.* to look about him, and anſwer for himſelf. I wiſh our Opponents would ſtick to one Thing, and not fly backwards and forwards: One while they reckon Baptiſm among the *Circumſtantials* of Religion; at another Time they give out, that by our pleading for, and uſing this Mode of Immerſion, we unchriſtian all *the other Proteſtant Churches*.

Churches. Juſt as if the Eſſentials of Religion could not *ſubſiſt*, where People are corrupt or defective in the Circumſtantials; or as if the Eſſentials were overthrown, by ſpeaking or writing againſt intolerable Corruptions in the Circumſtantials. But any Thing, tho' ever ſo inconſiſtent or ſenſeleſs, to caſt on *Odium* upon us!

'To impoſe any Thing as a Term of Communion, 'which Chriſt has not made ſo; and to unchriſtian and 'exclude from Communion, ſerious Chriſtians, upon 'Account of ſuch impoſed Circumſtances, is ſchiſma-'tical, uncharitable, and downright Bigotry.' What is all this, but an empty Noiſe, and groundleſs Exclamation, raiſed againſt us? Granting, that we admit none to our Communion, but thoſe who are regularly baptized, according to the Order of the Goſpel; which is not making new Terms of Communion; When did we ever attempt to impoſe this upon any Chriſtians whatſoever, or in the leaſt infringe on the Liberties of others? Have we attempted any Thing in any Way, but what the Scripture directs, and allows, *viz.* to convince them that differ from us by Scriptural Arguments? How can Mr. *F.* ſay, *that we unchriſtian and exclude from Communion ſerious Chriſtians*; do we hinder them from Communion in their reſpective Societies? And is it not the undoubted Privilege of all Chriſtian Societies to judge for themſelves, who ſhall be admitted into their Communion? Have we exceeded thoſe Bounds, or what is practical in other Communities? Let Mr. *F.* make out that we have, or elſe ceaſe to raiſe falſe and empty Outcries againſt us.

But it muſt be obſerv'd, that Mr. *Finley* is a very unfit Perſon to charge us with *Schiſm*: For is it not undeniably notorious, that he is deeply guilty of *it* himſelf, with others of his Aſſociates, from whoſe *Quarter* this Piece before me came? Do they call themſelves *Preſbyterians*, and † profeſs to hold the SAME *Confeſſion* of *Faith*, *Catechiſms*, and *Directory*, as the *Synod* does, and yet keep and maintain *ſeparate Communion* from their Brethren of the ſame *Faith* and *Practice*? What is that but SCHISM?

Again, What are the *new Erections of Meeting Houſes* hard by *Meeting Houſes*, and *Tents* by *Tents* through the Country,

† Vid. Mr. Blair's Animadverſions on Mr. Craighead's Receding, &c. p. 13.

Country, by the ſame *Denomination*, but *viſible* and *ſtanding* Signs of SCHISM?

Does Mr. *F.* think that he and his Brethren have ſufficient *Grounds* to juſtify themſelves in their preſent Situation; and will he not allow us the Liberty to ſtand for what we believe to be the *Order* and *Appointment* of Chriſt, and maintain our Communion ſeparate, while others can't ſee as we do, or we as they, without his charging our Practice to be *ſchiſmatical*, *uncharitable*, and *downright Bigotry*? STRANGE PARTIALITY!

We might have had the leaſt Reaſon to expect the heavy Charge of *Schiſm*, *Uncharitableneſs*, and Bigotry from that Quarter above any.---And if Mr. *F.* expects to do any Thing to Purpoſe in this Debate, he muſt uſe ſome Method beſides this, to convince us of what he ſuppoſes to be our Miſtake. But it is not *Bigotry* to hold and maintain *Immerſion* to be the *proper* and *ſcriptural* Mode of Baptizing, any otherwiſe than holding the Truth is ſo.

Finally: Seeing *Sprinkling* does no Way accord with the Meaning of the Word *Baptizo*, nor with the Examples of Baptiſm in Scripture, nor hath any Inſtances in Holy Writ to confirm it; neither does it anſwer the great Ends of Baptiſm, it evidently appears to be not the Mode appointed of God, but a mere human Invention: And the contrary, *viz. Immerſion*, to be the only proper ſcriptural Mode of Baptiſm, ſo ſufficiently confirmed by divine Authority, and worthily recommended to us, by the Doctrine and Example of Chriſt himſelf, and his bleſſed Apoſtles, for our conſtant Imitation and Practice.

20 MA 64

F I N I S.

AN APPENDIX

To the Foregoing WORK;

BEING

REMARKS

On some PARTICULARS in a late PAMPHLET,

Entituled,

Divine Right of INFANT-BAPTISM, *&c.*

Written by another HAND.

PHILADELPHIA:
Printed by B. FRANKLIN,
M,DCC,XLVII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

A N

APPENDIX

To the Foregoing WORK;

BEING

REMARKS

On ſome PARTICULARS in a late PAMPHLET,

Entituled,

Divine Right of INFANT-BAPTISM, *&c.*

HAVING ſeen and read the afore-mentioned Pamphlet written by an anonymous Author, under the feigned Pretence (as I ſuppoſe) of Diſcourſe between a Miniſter and one of his Pariſhioners; tho' I can ſee nothing in the ſaid Pamphlet contained againſt us who practiſe Adult-baptiſm, and queſtion the Validity of Infant-baptiſm, both as to the Mode and Subjects of it, but what hath been confuted over and over, by learned Men of our Perſuaſion, as Dr. *Gale*, Mr. *Keach*, Mr. *Stennet*, and many others; ſo that there would be no Need of ſpending Time and Pains in this Affair, were it not that the Advocates for the Abuſe of the ſacred Ordinance of Baptiſm, do ſtill thruſt their *Recocta Crambe*, or *Cawl Aildwym*, upon us, Time after Time; which hath occaſioned the foregoing Sheets on that Subject, in Anſwer to Mr. *F.* wherein ſome

Notice is alſo taken of the ſaid nameleſs Author, yet I think it is not out of the Way to ſay ſomething further to the ſaid anonymous Pamphleteer.

By the Way, why is it left in the Dark, and not made known to what Denomination of Pædo-baptiſts that Author belongs, as there are four Denominations that practiſe Sprinkling of Infants, *viz.* Church of *England* Men, Independants. Preſbyterians, and Papiſts; and 'tis a Wonder if this Gentleman doth not belong to one of the Four; I conjecture however, that he is either a Preſbyterian or a Papiſt; if I knew where to fix him, I ſhould know better how to meet him on his own Principles; but now I muſt treat him *in Ambiguo:* And as ſome of his Clamours againſt us who practiſe Adult-baptiſm, are only ſuch as were at the Reformation objected by the Papiſts againſt the Reformers in general, and which they do to this Day; therefore I cannot be much blamed, if by ſome of his Reaſonings I ſhould think him a Papiſt; or at leaſt, one that bears ſome Veneration for the Triple Crown.--Concerning the Mode and Subjects of Baptiſm, ſufficient hath been ſaid in the foregoing Work, that I will not at Preſent take it into Conſideration, as to dwell upon it.

In the eighth Page the Author aſketh his Neighbour a Queſtion, *viz. At what Time do you ſuppoſe Infant-baptiſm did firſt univerſally obtain in the Church?* and then brings in his Neighbour (as unread in Church-hiſtory) to ſay, *That the Authors he had read on that Subject, did not ſuppoſe this to have happen'd earlier than between three and four Hundred Years after Chriſt's Nativity*---To which he replies, and ſays, *If you had read the Authors on the other Side of the Queſtion, you would have found undoubted Evidence from the ancient Fathers, that Infant-baptiſm conſtantly obtained in the truly primitive Church, &c.* By Authors on the other Side of the Queſtion, doubtleſs he means Pædo-baptiſts; and it muſt be confeſſed, that ſeveral of them (like himſelf) have been more bold and dogmatick in aſſerting, than ſucceſsful in producing ſuch Evidence: That it hath been always not only doubted, but confuted, both from the Scripture, and the Fathers; yet

yet if this Author was ingenuous, he muſt own (unleſs he is ill-read indeed) that a great many of thoſe learned Authors, who practiſe Infant-baptiſm themſelves, have frankly owned the quite contrary; as the Reader may ſee in the foregoing Sheets; ſee alſo Mr. *Stennet* againſt *Ruſſen*, from Page 146 to 189; and them too of the firſt Rank for Learning and Searching, and had better Advantages to make Enquiry than our Author, living in *America*, could have. I ſhall have Occaſion to mention ſomething in this, and the next Page afterwards, therefore I proceed to conſider the tenth Page of this Pamphlet.

In Page the 10th, this Author puts the Queſtion to his Neighbour thus; *How came the Mad men of Munſter? How came the firſt Anti-Pædo-baptiſts in* England *by their Baptiſm? Had theſe any other Baptiſm than what they received in Infancy? If not (as 'tis certain they had not) it muſt follow, that either Infant-baptiſm is the Ordinance of Chriſt, or they could not have a Right to adminiſter that Ordinance to others, which they had not received themſelves; the Adminiſtration therefore (according to your own Principles) muſt be a Nullity in the Beginning, and conſequently muſt continue a Nullity ever ſince. The Baptiſm you pretend to, was (upon theſe Principles) firſt adminiſtred in* England *by unbaptized Perſons, by ſuch as were not ſo much as viſible Chriſtians themſelves, by ſuch who could therefore have no Claim to the Goſpel Miniſtry, nor any Right to adminiſter ſacred Ordinances; and conſequently, the whole Succeſſion of your Miniſtry from that Time, muſt remain unbaptized Perſons; and there can therefore be no Baptiſm among you, any more than among us, until there be a new Commiſſion from Heaven to renew and reſtore this Ordinance, which is at preſent loſt out of the World.*

As to the firſt Part of this Queſtion, *viz. How the Mad-men of* Munſter *came by their Baptiſm*; I think it is not the Buſineſs of any Man in the *Britiſh* Dominions, to give an Account of ſuch foreign Tranſactions, upon which we build none of our Practice; but I ſuppoſe this is mentioned here, and in the foregoing Page, on Purpoſe to caſt an Odium (if poſſible) on our Practice of

Adult-baptiſm: Now ſuppoſing this Author to be a Preſbyterian, as perhaps he is, and therefore adhering to the Model of Doctrine and Diſcipline ſet up at *Geneva*, by that famous Reformer Mr. *Calvin* and his Collegues, if this Gentleman will forſake every Thing that had an odious Name beſtowed on it, or that was maintained by ſome infamous Perſons, he muſt of Courſe renounce the moſt, if not all the fundamental Truths he holds, on the Account of infamous Names or ſcandalous Perſons that held the ſame; yea, he muſt renounce the *Genevian* Diſcipline too, for Dr. *Heylin* ſaith, that the *Genevian Diſcipline, was begotten in Rebellion, born in Sedition, and nurſed up by Faction*; ſee *Heylin*'s Coſmography, Page 160, Edit. 6. but as to the Anti-Pædo-baptiſts in *England*, it is ſufficient in this Place to ſay, they had not their Baptiſm from the Church of *Rome*, or any of her Prelates; and I ſhall (ſuppoſing this Gentleman a Preſbyterian) retort the Queſtion, and make bold to aſk him, How the Kirk of *Scotland* came by her Scriptureleſs Infant Sprinkling at firſt? I preſume it is not long ſince *England* and *Scotland* too, did wonder after the Beaſt of *Rome*, and had nothing in general but Idolatrous and Antichriſtian Adminiſtrations: At the Reformation then, How came the firſt Preſbyterians by their pretended Baptiſm? If they ſay they had it from *Rome*, as it is very like they will, then I infer, that the Kirk of *Scotland* muſt own, that Antichriſt hath been entruſted by Chriſt to adminiſter the Ordinances of his Goſpel, which is to adorn the Pope's Crown with a Feather, that Chriſt never intended the Son of Perdition to wear: His own Arguments muſt ſurely bear hard on this Author; had we our true Baptiſm from ſuch as were not viſible Chriſtians in his Account, he had a Scriptureleſs Baptiſm from viſible Antichriſtians in his own Account, unleſs our Author is a Papiſt; were our firſt Adminiſtrators unbaptized in his Account, ſo were the firſt Preſbyterians; unleſs our Author can prove, that Chriſt did give a Commiſſion to Antichriſt to alter the Ordinance of Baptiſm, both as to the Mode and Subject of it.

Our Author ſeems to argue, as if no Man may adminiſter

niſter otherwiſe than he received himſelf; Why then doth not the Kirk of *Scotland* adminiſter Infant-baptiſm as the Papiſts do? How came the firſt Preſbyterians to alter the Manner in which they received it in their Infancy? May not the Church of *Rome* caſt the ſame Reflections as juſtly on our Author (if he be a Proteſtant) as he doth on others?-- But why may not a Community of Chriſtian People, by mutual Conſent, and joined together in Covenant, warrantably reform their own Practice, as well as Principles, by the Word of God; and reſtore the primitive Uſe of Goſpel Ordinances, according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt in the New-Teſtament: If this be denied, then the Kirk of *Scotland* is highly faulty in withdrawing from the *Romiſh*; and this would Raze the Foundation of all the Reformation, to all Intents and Purpoſes: If it be granted that Chriſtian Communities, as aforeſaid, may reform, then I ſay, that our Churches are upon a Level with other Proteſtants, and have Warrant ſufficient to reform our own Practice in this Ordinance of Baptiſm, or any other, according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and the primitive Patterns found in the New-Teſtament.----And further, if (according to our Author's Way of Reaſoning) no Man may adminiſter otherwiſe than he received himſelf (tho' we ſee the Kirk of *Scotland* did not obſerve this at the Reformation) How came it to paſs, that ſome Preſbyterians have made bold to baptiſe adult Perſons by Dipping, which was otherwiſe than they received themſelves? This is fact; for Mr. *Benjamin Dutton* was baptized by Dipping by one that was a Preſbyterian Miniſter (and if he had been dipped by Mr. *Dutton* again, where would the Inconveniency be?) beſides other of like Inſtances, we could produce. Again, This Gentleman will find it difficult to reconcile his Reaſonings, and the Preſbyterian Practice together; for if our Adminiſtrations were (as he ſaith) a Nullity in the Beginning, and muſt continue a Nullity ever ſince, How do the Preſbyterians receive ſome that come over from us to them, without giving them a valid Baptiſm, if they have it, but in Fact, they receive ſuch; and I make no doubt but our Author himſelf would do it, if he had Opportunity, al-

tho' they had but a Nullity adminiſtred by ſuch as had no Right to adminiſter ſacred Ordinances (if this Gentleman may be believed.) Let him extricate himſelf and others from Inconſiſtency in this Affair if he can?

In this laſt cited Paragraph, there is ſomething inſinuated, which is (it ſeems) chiefly deſigned by our Anthor againſt our Miniſters, as if they had no Right to adminiſter ſacred Ordinances, nor any Claim to the Goſpel Miniſtry: Now, ſuppoſing this nameleſs Author to be a Preſbyterian, I ſhall preſume to aſk him a Queſtion, *viz.*

How came the firſt Preſbyterians by their Right to adminiſter Sacred Ordinances, and a Claim to the Goſpel Miniſtry? (not that I diſpute whether they have ſuch a Right and Claim or no, that is not my Buſineſs) But how came they by the Right and Claim they poſſeſs? If he will ſay (as ſome others have ſaid) that they have it by an uninterrupted Succeſſion of Men ordain'd from the Apoſtles, then I demand the authentic Record of that Succeſſion till the Reformation at leaſt, and who were the Perſons in whom it was veſted at the Reformation, and how it was conferred on the Preſbyterians; if that Gentleman, or ſomebody for him, cannot anſwer my Demand, I ſhall conclude that the Baptiſt Miniſters (being endowed with Gifts by God, and called regularly by our Churches) have a Right to adminiſter ſacred Ordinances, and as good a Claim to the Goſpel Miniſtry as any others (our Author not accepted) But perhaps he will derive his Right and Claim from *Rome* (as I am informed the Preſbyterians have of late) then I deſire our Author may be pleaſed to inform us, whether the Kirk of *Rome* was a Chriſttian or Antichriſtian Church, at the Time when the Kirk of *Scotland* did withdraw from her? Now if the Church of *Rome* was a regular Chriſtian Church at that Time, and had valid Baptiſm, Ordination, and other Eſſentials of a regular Chriſtian Church; then the Church of *Scotland* was a Schiſmatical Church at the Beginning, and muſt continue ſo ever ſince; and conſequently her Miniſters have but a Schiſmatical Right to the Goſpel Miniſtry, and the Adminiſtration of ſacred Ordinances.

On the other Side, if the Church of *Rome*, at and before the Reformation, was become Antichriſtian, the Myſtery of *Babylon*, the Mother of Harlots, and the Pope Antichriſt, the Beaſt, and the Son of Perdition (as I think it is not to be doubted of by any Proteſtant) as Mr. *Rutherford*, Mr. *Durham*, and others, both Foreign and Domeſtick, have made to appear; then ſuch as derive their Right and Claim to the Goſpel Miniſtry from *Rome* Papal, muſt have but a very defective Original; and I think that if the Baptiſts did derive from the Mad-men of *Munſter*, it would not be a greater Ignominy, as ſcandalous as they are deemed to be. But ſuch Proteſtants as would go to *Rome* for their firſt Right to adminiſter Goſpel Ordinances, and a Claim to the Miniſtry, ought to make out theſe two Things very clear, *viz. Firſt*, That Antichriſt hath been entruſted and authorized by Chriſt, to convey valid Ordination to the Miniſters of his Goſpel: *Secondly*, That Goſpel Ordinances were not abuſed and baſely adulterated by that Mother of Harlots, the Church of *Rome*. As to the Firſt, we have the firſt Reformers of the Church of *England*, diſclaiming any Orders from *Rome*, and ſaying, We defy, deteſt, and abhor their Stinking, Greaſy, Antichriſtian Orders. The famous *Whitaker* ſays, *I would not have you think that we make ſuch Reckoning of your Orders, as to hold our own Vocation unlawful without them*: Whitaker *Contra Duræum*. Dr. *Fulk* alſo ſaith, *You are much deceived, if you think we eſteem your Offices of Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, any better than Laymen; and you preſume too much, to think that we receive your Orderings to be lawful*; Fulk's *Anſwer to the Counterfeit Catholick*; both cited by Mr. *Daviſon* in his Vindication of the Proteſtant Miniſter's Miſſion, p. 53, 54. and the ſaid *Daviſon* in the ſame 54th Page, cites Biſhop *Burnet*'s Expoſition on the 39 Articles of the Church of *England*, p. 257. where are theſe Words on the 23d Article, which relates to Ordination, *This Article doth not reſolve this into any particular Conſtitution, but leaves that Matter open and at large, for ſuch Accidents as had happened, and ſuch as might ſtill happen: They who drew it, had the State of the ſeveral Churches*

Churches before their Eyes, that had been differently reformed; and tho' their own had been leſs forced to go out of the beaten Path than others, yet they knew that all Things among themſelves, had not gone according to thoſe Rules which ought to be ſacred in regular Times; but Neceſſity has no Law, and is a Law to itſelf.

We ſee the Reformers of the Church of *England* did not think proper to derive any Orders from *Rome*, nor that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt had entruſted Antichriſt with any ſuch Orders, elſe they would pay their Deference, and not their Abhorrence to ſuch Ordinations; they therefore without a new Commiſſion did proceed to a Reformation. And I muſt in Charity think, that the Church of *Scotland* went about a Reformation on the ſame Grounds, tho' in a different Manner, without paying that Deference to *Rome*, which (it ſeems) ſome that would be accounted Succeſſors to thoſe godly Reformers, are too willing to do. Now then, What Reaſon can be rendered why other Communities of Chriſtians, as Baptiſts and Independants, might not ſet about a further Reformation, tho' in a ſome-what different Manner, without either deriving their Right and Claim from the Triple Crown, or yet pretending to a new Commiſſion from Heaven, to renew and reſtore Goſpel Ordinances, as this Author would inſinuate?

As to the Second, It was the common Complaint at the Reformation, that the Church of *Rome* had neither pure Ordinances, nor regular Adminiſtrations: And if ſo, then ſuppoſing, but not granting, that Infant-ſprinkling was an Ordinance of Chriſt, the Preſbyterians themſelves muſt have it from unbaptized Perſons; and (which is far worſe) from viſible Antichriſtians; and ſo it muſt be (according to our reverend Author himſelf) a Nullity in the Beginning, and continue a Nullity ever ſince; and then the Anti-pædo-baptiſts are upon the Par at leaſt with the Kirk of *Scotland*, or any other, without waiting for a new Commiſſion; if our Author could make out thoſe Points, he would deſerve better of the See of *Rome*, than any of her own delicate Sons.

Our

Our Author in Page 8th hath theſe Words, *You muſt allow, that there was more than* 1100 *Years, in which the whole Chriſtian Church came into the united and conſtant Practice of Infant baptiſm; you can't pretend that this Practice was called in Queſtion, or made a Matter of Debate in the Church, till the Mad-men of* Munſter *ſet themſelves againſt it, &c.* I am loth to think this Author was as ignorant as he feigns himſelf to be, and as loth to conclude that he took Liberty to ſay any Thing to prejudice the Populace againſt Adult-baptiſm, and to promote Bigotry; but his Aſſertion is without good Warrant, according to the Judgment of many learned Pædo-baptiſts (as I hinted before) and it is too well-known to be denied, that Infant-baptiſm was not mentioned in the firſt Century, and was not common till the third or fourth Centuries, if not the Fifth; and we have undoubted Account of Debate made about it in the Year 1025, by *Gundulphus* and his Followers in *Italy*; ſee *Croſby*'s Preface to Vol. 1. of his Hiſtory of the *Engliſh* Baptiſts; and *Stennet* againſt *Ruſſen*, Page 84; and Dr. *Wall* mentions *Bruno* and *Begenarius* that apeared to oppoſe it 1035, which was at leaſt three Hundred Years before the Inſurrection of *Munſter*; by which it appears, that the Account given by this Gentleman is not to be depended on in this Affair.

Our Author in Page the 9th, hath theſe Words, *Now during this long Period* (i. e. the ſaid 1100 Years) *What became of our bleſſed Saviour's Promiſe, to be with his Miniſters always, in the Adminiſtration of this Ordinance* (meaning Baptiſm) and demands an Anſwer, Was he with them, or was he not? And then draws Inferences from an Affirmative or Negative Anſwer, ſaying, *If you Anſwer in the Affirmative, you acknowledge Infant baptiſm to be his own Inſtitution: If you Anſwer in the Negative, you call his Veracity and Faithfulneſs into Queſtion.* Here is a ſtrong Piece to be ſure, in the Author's Account, his Argument hath two Horns, but they are not good Metal; for will he himſelf affirm this Promiſe is confined to Baptiſm only? Or doth it not extend to the Teaching mentioned before and after Baptiſm, in the Commiſſion

miſſion, *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20? I muſt in Charity hope that God hath bleſſed the Doctrine of the Goſpel to the ſaving of many Souls, in the Mouths of ſome Men who do not regularly baptize; as our Author for one, if a Proteſtant. And here I would aſk this Pamphleteer, To what Denomination of Miniſters was that Promiſe fulfilled, during a great Part of that long Period, from the 4th to the 16th Century; for the true Church for a great Part of that Time, hath been under the Height and Heat of Antichriſt's Tyranny, and the Promiſe did not appertain to the Miniſters of Antichriſt, tho' they pretended to baptiſe: No, they were the devouring Locuſts, whoſe King is the Angel of the Bottomleſs Pit; ſee Mr. *Durham* on *Revel.* Page 416, *&c. Glaſ.* Edit. Nor was it to the Preſbyterian Miniſters; for that Denomination was not heard of, till about the Year 1541. Our Author will not allow the *Waldenſes* to put in for the Subjects of our Lord's Promiſe, in that dark Time; and good Reaſon why, leaſt he ſhould countenance any Thing againſt Infant-baptiſm; but by his Leave, that the *Waldenſes* and others I mentioned before, being Oppoſers of Infant-baptiſm, and in the Practice of Adult-baptiſm, is not ſuch a Figment, as our Author in Page 11th would have it to be; as appears by the Teſtimonies produced by Mr. *Stennet* againſt *Ruſſen*, Page 81--84. which I ſhould have tranſcribed, but my Bounds will not permit; and that the Firſt that revived the ancient Practice of Adult-baptiſm in *England*, had it from them, is no more unlikely, than for the Preſbyterians to have their Diſcipline from *Geneva*; for the *Engliſh* had Poſſeſſion of thoſe Parts of *France* where the *Waldenſes* were moſtly countenanced, from the Year 1152 to the Year 1452, which was long enough for many Perſons to become acquainted with the Principles and Practice of thoſe godly People, by ſuch Intercourſe, and from their Example, to endeavour a Reformation in *England*, tho' with no great Succeſs for a while: Our Author will find it difficult to fix on any Subjects of that Promiſe, in the Weſtern Parts of the World; at leaſt (if the *Waldenſes* were not) during a good Part of that Period; nor can he prove the

united

united Practice of Infant-baptiſm during the ſaid Period, while the ſaid *Waldenſes* and others have oppoſed it, and practiſed otherwiſe, within the ſaid Term; and if he could, it would be but a Scriptureleſs Practice ſtill.

Now, upon the whole, the Truth is, That the true Church and Spouſe of Jeſus Chriſt, hath been in the Wilderneſs the moſt Part of that long Period, and her faithful Miniſters very few (tho' there was moſtly, if not always, ſome hidden ones) and thoſe few propheſying in Sackcloth, as is ſaid, *Revelation* Chap. xi. 3. And it ſeems by ſome Part of that Prophecy, that the Witneſſes ſhould be entirely killed, as to the outward Viſibility, for a Time, and Popery in its Triumph; and at ſuch a Time, the united Practice muſt be found in all Popery, if ever: But when it pleaſed God to bring Life and Immortality to Light again by the Goſpel, all that forſook the Antichriſtian See of *Rome*, had but the Foundation of the Apoſtles, and Chriſt himſelf as a chief Corner Stone, to build upon: At the Reformation therefore, every Company of Chriſtians, whom God moved by his Spirit, and enabled by Grace, did ſet about a Reformation; and as all then did not ſee alike, and thro' their ſeeing but in Part, it came to paſs (as Biſhop *Burnet*, above cited, ſaid) that ſeveral Churches were differently reformed, and it being ſo that they had neither pure Ordinances, nor regular Adminiſtrators from *Rome*, it is no Wonder that if by that Neceſſity thoſe ſeveral Chriſtian Communities went out of the beaten Path (as the ſaid Biſhop ſaid of the Church of *England*) and could not go according to thoſe Rules that ought to be ſacred in regular Times, in Matters of Ordination; and upon the ſame Footing, all the Reformation ſtood; and the Kirk of *Scotland* muſt ſtand ſo likewiſe; going to *Geneva* will not mend the Matter in the leaſt; for the Firſt muſt either derive from *Rome*, which Proteſtants would not then do, or elſe endeavour to follow the imitable Example of the Apoſtles in the New-Teſtament, tho' the Path had been a while diſuſed and interrupted, by Reaſon of *Romiſh* Cruelty, and the dark Smoak that aſcended out of the Botomleſs Pit.

We

We are perſuaded, not withſtanding any Thing our Author may endeavour to throw at our Miniſters or our Practice, that we ſtand on as good Ground, as other Proteſtants do; and we think with the Reverend Mr. *Daviſon* afore-mentioned, that a Succeſſion of the Apoſtles Doctrine believed and received by a People of any Nation, and being ſatisfied of one another's Graces and Principles, and being thereupon united together by mutual Covenant, to promote the Glory of GOD, and the mutual Advantage of each others Souls, and the Good of others, in the publick Worſhip of GOD: We ſay, ſuch a Community, have ſufficient Authority from Chriſt, to call and conſtitute whom they ſhall judge qualified, to miniſter among them in holy Things. This being agreeable to the true Proteſtant Principle, upon which the whole Reformation was built. Upon this Proteſtant Principle therefore we ſatisfy our ſelves, that our Churches have in them ſufficient to give our Miniſters as valid a Miſſion as other Proteſtants have; and a regular Right and Claim to preach the Goſpel, and to adminiſter the ſacred Ordinances according to our LORD's pure Inſtitution, without going to *Rome*, or elſewhere, for it, and without waiting for a new Commiſſion from Heaven, to renew and reſtore them (as our Author vainly inſinuates) for we eſteem the Commiſſion, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. 20. *Mark* xvi. 15, 16. as ſtill in force.

I ſhall not trouble my ſelf at Preſent, with any Thing further in the ſaid Pamphlet, but adviſe the Author (if living) not to make further Uſe of old *Romiſh* Clamours; and if he is a Miniſter of any reformed Church, to be more ſparing of his Flings, leaſt he find them to hit himſelf, and he be found ſapping the Grounds of the whole Reformation, by his zealous Endeavouring to defend a Scriptureleſs Practice.

20 MA 64

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

PAGE 32, *l.* 9. *for* imitating, *r.* initiating. *Page* 158, *l.* 10 *from the Bottom*, *for* Community, *r.* Communion.

By reaſon of the Author's Diſtance and Abſence from the Preſs, ſome more Errors, beſides thoſe above noted, may perhaps be found in this Work; which the candid Reader is deſired to correct, according to the Scope of the Diſcourſe, where they may occur.

20 MA 64